S. HRG. 100-612

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

EXAMINING PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF VOLUNTARY, NATIONAL STANDARDS OF COMPETENCE FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

FEBRUARY 18, 1988

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

84-356 WASHINGTON : 1988

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

S541-43

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire

THOMAS M. ROLLINS, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
KEVIN S. MCGUINESS, *Minority Staff Director and Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut

DAVID V. EVANS, *Staff Director*
POLLY L. GAULT, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1988

Page

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Council for Educational Development and Research, prepared statement 141

Finn, Dr. Chester E., Jr., Assistant Secretary, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC; Alan K. Campbell, vice chairman of the board and executive vice president, ARA Services, chairman of the Committee for Economic Development's Task Force on the Teaching Profession, Philadelphia, PA; Gordon M. Ambach, executive director, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, DC; and Dr. James A. Wilsford, superintendent, Orangeburg School District No. 5, Orangeburg, SC, American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, VA 70

Prepared statements of:

Dr. Finn 73

Mr. Campbell 84

Mr. Ambach 94

Dr. Wilsford 100

Futrell, Mary Hatwood, president, National Education Association, Washington, DC; Albert Shanker, president, American Federation of Teachers, Washington, DC; Dr. Barbara Hatton, program officer, Ford Foundation Education and Culture Program, New York, NY, and former professor and dean of the School of Education, Tuskegee Institute, AL; and Bradley Blanchette, high school English teacher, 1986 Vermont Teacher of the year, Colchester, VT 107

Prepared statements of:

Ms. Futrell 110

Mr. Shanker 120

Dr. Hatton 128

Mr. Blanchette 135

Hatch, Hon. Orrin G., a U.S. Senator from the State of Utah, prepared statement 4

Hunt, Hon. James B., Jr., former Governor of North Carolina, chair, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; Hon. Thomas S. Kean, Governor of New Jersey; James E. Kelly, president, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Washington, DC; and Susan Adler Kaplan, high school English teacher, 1983 Providence Teacher of the Year, Providence, RI 10

Prepared statements of:

Governor Hunt 16

Governor Kean 30

Ms. Kaplan 54

Orr, Bob, Governor, prepared statement 6

Simon, Hon. Paul, a U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois, prepared statement 139

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1988

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES
OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Christopher J. Dodd, presiding.

Present: Senators Dodd, Stafford, and Thurmond.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR DODD

Senator DODD. The subcommittee will come to order.

First of all, let me express the regrets of the chairman of this subcommittee, Senator Pell. As most of you know there are ongoing hearings on the Foreign Relations Committee of the INF Treaty. Senator Pell is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and his primary responsibility is to move that hearing process along. So it is a distinct honor for me, as a relatively junior member of this full committee, to chair this subcommittee hearing, and particularly to have sitting at my left Bob Stafford. I have often said the firm of Stafford and Pell or Pell and Stafford have done more for education than any two other people. If there are any rivals to that, they are the people, Bob, sitting in front of us this morning—two Governors and others who are involved directly in the education profession—who have done a tremendous amount as well.

I apologize on behalf of Senator Pell. He would very much liked to have chaired this hearing. He has a deep interest in this subject matter and has been involved in it for years. So he regrets deeply that he had to make a choice between the INF Treaty and this particular hearing. But as I said, Bob Stafford is here.

I mentioned to Governor Hunt yesterday that this is a particular pleasure for me. I really do not have much choice in these issues. I have two siblings: one who is a public school teacher in Hartford and has been a teacher for almost 30 years; a brother who has taught for 20 years at Georgetown at the Foreign Service School; and three aunts who taught for 45 years apiece in the public school system of Connecticut, founding members of the Connecticut Education Association. I am reluctant to say that with Al Shanker here this morning, but I think he will appreciate it. I get lobbied

heavily on education matters, I want to tell you. This is an issue that I feel all the time when I go home.

Let me just take a couple of minutes with an opening statement, if I can. I will turn to my colleague, Bob Stafford, and then we will be pleased to hear from our first panel of witnesses.

First of all, I want to welcome all of you here this morning, and members of the public who are also in the audience, to the Senate Education Subcommittee hearing on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Today, we will review the board's exciting plans for reforming the teaching profession and for the prospects for Federal legislation to help the board achieve its goals.

America today stands on the brink of a socioeconomic transformation unparalleled since the industrial revolution. We are becoming a Nation of words and information, a Nation whose ability to develop and utilize new technologies will largely determine our future economic growth, employment opportunities, and our relative standing in a highly competitive world economy.

The Nation's schools obviously will play a very critical role as we prepare the next generation of American workers to meet these new economic demands and opportunities. But to help our schools meet this challenge, we must shed the national mindset which measures the success of educational reforms based on old standards of performance established in a much different time. It is no longer enough to repair our schools. We are going to have to rebuild them. It is no longer enough to reverse declining school performance. We are going to have to achieve higher standards than ever before.

America's young people still need good basic skills, but the economic demands of the future will require them to think critically and creatively in a complex and changing work environment. If our children are to have these skills, if our schools are to be redesigned for the 21st century, we need a well-educated teaching profession that is equal to the task. Unfortunately, that may be easier said than done.

An aging teaching force, combined with rising enrollments, will require the hiring of 1.3 million new teachers over the next six years. But low pay, poor working conditions, and the lure of other professions continue to deter the best and brightest from choosing teaching careers.

The choice is now upon us. Do we lower standards simply to get bodies into classrooms? Or do we aim much higher and attempt to attract young people to teaching by radically reforming the very nature of the profession? Enter the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and the timing could not be better. Through its independent and voluntary certification process, the board can provide the necessary motivation and reinforcement for a radical transformation of the teaching profession and the ways schools educate our children.

First and foremost, it will help to raise teacher standards, performance and pay, and thus improve the effectiveness and quality of the profession. Second, the board will provide more demanding and uniform national criteria for States to use in upgrading licensing standards and teacher education programs. Third, the board will provide uniform measurement techniques for school districts to use in developing new hiring and promotion standards. Fourth,

and perhaps most importantly, the board will help pave the way for teachers to achieve broader autonomy in the classroom while being held accountable for student performance.

Taken together, these four reforms, I believe, will help schools to attract better qualified applicants to teaching by raising the visibility and rewards of the profession. At today's hearing, we will review the goals and plans of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards with members of the board and its staff. We will also consider the board's plans in the context of other educational reforms taking place throughout this country, including improvements in State licensing procedures.

Finally, the subcommittee and the full committee, and I hope the Senate will discuss prospective legislation to provide Federal support for the research and development activities necessary to implement the board's assessment procedures.

Let me just very briefly, Bob, if I can, point out what we are up against graphically on these charts.

The demand statistic, the very dark line, shows the demand for teachers that we will have by 1992. This line is the actual supply we are getting of teachers today. And this number here, this lighter line, is the enrollment, the numbers are going up. So you can see just by those three lines—the demand line, the present supply line, and the enrollment line—what a tremendous gap we face. That is where the 1.3 million new teachers comes in over the next six years.

The second graph shows you that the attendant occupation of the general supply over the years have been women in the teaching profession. If you are looking at freshmen women in college, looking at professions, alternative professions, the dark line represents the teaching profession as a choice. These are over the last several years from 1984 into 1985, and this number here represents the business profession. So, again, we see that decline in the number of women who are pursuing a teaching career. That is good news for women who now have different opportunities. So it is not necessarily bad news except that the supply is obviously affected by the change in career choices.

These lines are maybe the most disturbing lines of all. These are the math SAT scores and the verbal SAT scores, again, by choice. The darker line is the average SAT score of a senior in high school, both in math and verbal. The second line maps the SAT math and verbal for people who intend to go into education. So we find among seniors in high school the tremendous disparity here between the two averages. That is a dark statistic. By the way, these are college-bound seniors, I should add.

This chart gives you an idea of the salary differences. The dark line represents teacher salaries versus accountant salaries, which is the lighter line here. These are the percentages down here. What you are seeing is up into the 25 or early $20,000 range, you find that teachers do a bit better than accountants. Once you get in the 25 range, however, you see a dramatic shift. There is a tremendous disparity in the percentage at different income levels.

This is just a comparison of salary ranges by occupation. Without casting aspersions on any occupation the chart begins with attorneys to chief accountants, then chemists, systems analysis account-

ants, buyers, mail carriers, then teachers, plumbers, airline ticket agents, and secretaries. Again, you see the teacher salaries down in the lower range.

The charts are an indication of what our priorities are as a Nation.

The charts point out the problems we face in terms of supply, the quality of people going in, the salaries and so forth that are being offered, and the demand we obviously face.

Let me turn to Bob Stafford now for any opening comments he may have, and then we will go directly to our panel.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR STAFFORD

Senator STAFFORD. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to join you this morning as we examine the important questions that are being raised about the quality of American Education, and especially today, how we must select the very best teachers to work with our children. I think you have laid out the problems in front of us so thoroughly that I would be redundant if I made an opening statement.

We do have one very able Vermont teacher in the audience who I will say something about later on when his panel comes forward. In the meantime, I think my role here will be to listen to these very distinguished witnesses that we have in front of us, and those that will follow.

I will say that you mentioned being lobbied a bit in your family for education. I happen to have one of our daughters who is a school teacher in Essex Junction, Vermont. She is one of the youngest but the most outspoken of our children, and, therefore, I can assure you that I——

Senator DODD. That often happens with those of us who are younger. [Laughter.]

Senator STAFFORD. I get thoroughly lobbied every time I go back to Vermont on problems facing the educational community.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am ready for the witnesses.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Bob.

I would ask unanimous consent that an opening statement by Senator Hatch be included in the record.

[The prepared statement of Senator Hatch follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR HATCH

Senator HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for holding this hearing of the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities on the topic of funding for the National Board of Professional Teacher Standards.

All the members of this Subcommittee recognize the critical need for new ideas and procedures if we are to improve the quality of education offered across this country. Some of these new ideas should be pursued by the private sector, some by the Federal Government, and some by a public-private partnership. The need to improve the quality of education requires that we keep an open mind about both any proposed suggestions and how and by whom they should be pursued.

That is the purpose of this morning's hearing. We shall hear plans for a new, optional national teacher certification process and a discussion of the merits of and ways the Federal Government might assist in its development. Because enhancing the professional calibre and stature of the teaching profession is one of the most important ways we can upgrade education, I intend to consider carefully all of the testimony offered this morning. I shall also continue to solict advice from parents and educators from my home state of Utah on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, again I thank you for holding this hearing of the Subcommittee. I also extend my thanks to all the witnesses who have taken the time to be with us this morning.

Senator DODD. I would also make note of the fact that Governor Orr intended to be with us this morning. His flight out of Indiana was delayed. He called but would not have gotten here in time for the hearing. He will be submitting a statement for the record.

[The prepared statement of Governor Orr follows:]

GOV. BOB ORR
TESTIMONY
U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities
WASHINGTON, D.C.
FEBRUARY 18, 1988

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, AND MOST ESPECIALLY MY FELLOW HOOSIER, SENATOR QUAYLE: THANK YOU FOR GRANTING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY ON ONE OF THE MOST EXCITING DEVELOPMENTS IN A DECADE OF EDUCATION REFORM IN AMERICA.

THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION AND THE CARNEGIE FORUM ON EDUCATION AND THE ECONOMY ARE TO BE PARTICULARLY APPLAUDED. IN 1986, BUILDING UPON THE MOMENTUM OF THE NATIONWIDE EDUCATION REFORM MOVEMENT, THE CARNEGIE FORUM GAVE US ITS LANDMARK REPORT ENTITLED A NATION PREPARED: TEACHERS FOR THE 21st CENTURY.

THE CORNERSTONE RECOMMENDATION OF THE FORUM'S REPORT WAS ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS. I AM HERE TODAY, AS GOVERNOR OF A STATE WHICH STANDS AMONG THE LEADERS IN EDUCATION REFORM, TO CONVEY MY SUPPORT — AND THAT OF DEAN EVANS, INDIANA'S OUTSTANDING STATE SCHOOLS SUPERINTENDENT — FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A VOLUNTARY NATIONAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS, AND FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENDORSEMENT OF THE EFFORT.

OUR SUPERINTENDENT AND I BELIEVE — AS DO MANY OF MY FELLOW GOVERNORS — THAT NATIONAL CERTIFICATION CAN HELP MAKE TEACHING A TRUE PROFESSION IN EVERY SENSE OF THE WORD.

I FIND ONE THING ABOUT THIS PROJECT PARTICULARLY ENCOURAGING. IT IS FURTHER EVIDENCE OF A BROAD MOVEMENT TO SET HIGHER STANDARDS IN EDUCATION — HIGHER STANDARDS FOR STUDENTS, HIGHER STANDARDS FOR

ADMINISTRATORS, AND HIGHER STANDARDS FOR TEACHERS.

NEVER BEFORE IN THE HISTORY OF OUR COUNTRY HAS IT BEEN MORE IMPORTANT TO EXPECT MORE FROM OURSELVES AND OUR SCHOOLS. FROM PRE-SCHOOL TO GRADUATE SCHOOL, WE'RE BEGINNING TO ASK MORE OF OUR STUDENTS IN AN ATTEMPT TO PREPARE THEM BETTER FOR A MORE COMPETITIVE WORLD. IT'S A WORLD IN WHICH AMERICA'S ECONOMIC PREEMINENCE IS NO LONGER A GIVEN. NOR ARE WE AT THE TOP OF THE LIST IN EDUCATION.

ONLY THE BEST-EDUCATED WORKFORCE WILL BE ABLE TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE A STANDARD OF LIVING TO WHICH WE'VE GROWN ACCUSTOMED AND TO WHICH OUR NEW ECONOMIC COMPETITORS AGGRESSIVELY ASPIRE.

IN AN EFFORT TO MAKE US MORE SUCCESSFUL IN COMPETITION WITH THE REST OF THE WORLD, WE'RE NOT ONLY ASKING MORE FROM THOSE INVOLVED IN EDUCATION, WE'RE GIVING THEM MORE SUPPORT, AS WELL. MORE TIME TO LEARN, SMALLER CLASS SIZES, EMPHASIS ON GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS, PROGRAMS FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS, COMPUTERS AS TOOLS OF THE CLASSROOM, GENERAL FUNDING INCREASES COUPLED WITH PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH STATEWIDE TESTING AND REQUIRED REMEDIATION FOR WEAKER STUDENTS.

PREPARING OUR STUDENTS FOR AN INTENSELY COMPETITIVE INTERNATIONAL FUTURE WAS THE PRIMARY RATIONALE BEHIND INDIANA'S DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION LAST YEAR OF THE NATIONALLY ACCLAIMED "A+ PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE." A+ IS AN INNOVATIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE REFORM PACKAGE ABOUT WHICH I EARLIER TESTIFIED ON CAPITOL HILL.[1]

---

1. Gov Orr testified on the A+ Program before the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Education and Health on Oct. 27, 1987.

THE A+ PROGRAM WAS NAMED FOR ITS GOALS OF RAISING ASPIRATIONS, INCREASING ACCOUNTABILITY AND REWARDING ACHIEVEMENT. NATURALLY, THE MAIN FOCUS IS ON STUDENTS AND WHAT THEY'RE SUPPOSED TO LEARN. WE WANT TO LIFT THEIR ASPIRATIONS AND REWARD THEIR SCHOOLS WHEN THEIR PERFORMANCE IMPROVES.

BUT WE HAVE NOT IGNORED THE CRITICAL NEED TO RAISE ASPIRATIONS, ACHIEVEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, ADMINISTRATORS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AS WELL. THE A+ PROGRAM CONTINUES FUNDING FOR THE INDIANA PRINCIPALS LEADERSHIP ACADEMY, A PROGRAM WE ESTABLISHED THREE YEARS AGO TO INSPIRE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND BETTER BUILDING MANAGEMENT SKILLS AMONG INDIANA PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS.

THE A+ PROGRAM ALSO REQUIRES ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS FOR TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS. WE HAVE INSTITUTED A BEGINNING TEACHER INTERNSHIP PROGRAM REQUIRING ALL NEW TEACHERS TO SPEND A YEAR AS AN INTERN TEACHER UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A MENTOR TEACHER BEFORE CONTINUED STATE CERTIFICATION IS GRANTED.

THESE LAST TWO PROGRAMS — PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND BEGINNING TEACHER INTERNSHIPS — WILL GIVE US MORE INFORMATION THAN EVER ON HOW TO DEFINE GOOD TEACHING.

THE MOVEMENT TOWARD NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION TAKES THIS "R & D" EFFORT THAT WE'RE MAKING IN INDIANA AND EXPANDS IT TO THE NATIONAL LEVEL. I BELIEVE THIS MAY BE THE MOST EXCITING ASPECT OF NATIONAL CERTIFICATION, THIS NATIONWIDE EFFORT TO DEFINE TRUE PROFESSIONALISM IN THE CLASSROOM.

LET ME ALSO MAKE THE POINT HERE THAT BY FUNDING DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL TEACHER CERTIFICATION, CONGRESS WOULD REMAIN CONSISTENT

WITH THE FEDERAL EDUCATION POLICY OF SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WHILE LEAVING THE ACTUAL DELIVERY AND ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATION TO STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS WHERE IT BELONGS.

AS I SAID IN A SPEECH TO A CARNEGIE-SPONSORED EDUCATION SYMPOSIUM IN INDIANAPOLIS LAST MONTH, "WE EMBRACE THIS IDEA AS MUCH FOR WHAT IT ISN'T AS FOR WHAT IT IS. THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHER STANDARDS IS CONCERNED NOT WITH TEACHER LICENSING — A STATE FUNCTION — BUT WITH VOLUNTARY PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION."

BECAUSE IT WILL GREATLY EXPAND THIS COUNTRY'S "R & D" EFFORTS TO DEFINE GOOD TEACHING, NATIONAL CERTIFICATION HAS THE POTENTIAL TO AFFECT HOW WE LICENSE TEACHERS IN THE LONG RUN. IN FACT, IT MUST HAVE ASSURE A LONG-TERM POSITIVE IMPACT ON HOW WE PREPARE TEACHERS IN OUR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

I AM SATISFIED THAT THE BOARD WILL COME UP WITH A CERTIFICATION PROCESS THAT MEASURES UP AGAINST THE STANDARDS SET BY OUR A+ PROGRAM, THAT IT WILL RAISE ASPIRATIONS, INCREASE ACHIEVEMENT AND PROVIDE GREATER ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN THE TEACHING PROFESSION. IN DOING SO, THEY WILL HELP TO RENEW AMERICA'S CONFIDENCE IN A PROFESSION THAT HAS ALWAYS HAD A PROFOUND EFFECT ON OUR NATION'S WELL-BEING. THIS WILL BE PARTICULARLY TRUE AS WE ENTER AN ERA WHERE EDUCATION MUST SUPPLY THE MUSCLE TO COMPETE SUCCESSFULLY IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA, WHERE FAST-BREAKING CHANGE AROUND THE WORLD WILL FORCE VAST CHANGE ON AN AMERICA WHERE HIGHER STANDARDS WILL BECOME THE NORM.

I ASK ONCE MORE THAT CONGRESS ENDORSE THE MISSION OF THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS.

THANK YOU.

Senator DODD. Let me begin with some brief introductions. First of all we welcome Jim Hunt, the former governor of North Carolina, who chairs the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Governor Hunt happens to be a good personal friend of mine. I have had the opportunity over the years to deal with him on a number of different issues. He is well known not only within political circles but also within education circles. He is not a newcomer to this issue, but as a two-term governor of his State, is deeply involved in educational issues. He chairs this board and was active as a governor in the early days in trying to make education a dominant issue.

Governor Kean of New Jersey, our fathers served together in the Congress of the United States. He is the fifth of sixth children, one of those younger children we were talking about. We have that similarity as well. We had no choice. When you are that low in the litter, you have to be loud and vociferous or you will never be heard in large families. He has done a tremendous amount in this area and is known as the lead governor in the country on educational matters. He has some very creative and innovative programs in New Jersey. He is also a former teacher and brings that unique perspective to today's discussion.

We also have with us Jim Kelly, the President of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. And Susan Kaplan, a high school English teacher, Providence Teacher of the year in 1983, and a very close friend of my sisters. I received a call saying I had to be nice to Ms. Kaplan. [Laughter.]

My sister lives in Providence, and I had dinner with them on Saturday night so I really have to be kind. Delighted to have you here this morning.

Your statements in their entirety will be included in the record here this morning. Why don't we begin with the governors. Jim, we will begin with you, and then Tom and Mr. Kelly and Ms. Kaplan and go right on down the line. Welcome.

STATEMENTS OF HON. JAMES B. HUNT, JR., FORMER GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIR, NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS; HON. THOMAS H. KEAN, GOVERNOR OF NEW JERSEY; JAMES A. KELLY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS, WASHINGTON, DC; AND SUSAN ADLER KAPLAN, HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHER, 1983 PROVIDENCE TEACHER OF THE YEAR, PROVIDENCE, RI

Governor HUNT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Stafford.

If our Nation is to become the truly good society that we hope for, if we are going to out-compete the world economically as we are talking about so much today, it is essential that we make education in America a national obsession; that all of our people in this country learn to think for a living. I believe that the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards will do more to help bring that about in our lifetime—you and I were talking yesterday, Mr. Chairman, about what would happen in our lifetime and how it would look later on. I think this will do more to make education

truly excellent in this country in our lifetime than anything else that is being considered in our country today.

Now, to understand how this board can have such a profound impact, I would urge that we think about what happened in this country 78 years ago. At that time, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, being very concerned about the quality of medical care in America—just as we are about education today—commissioned a man named Abraham Flexner to examine standards for medical doctors. He found those standards to be very low or nonexistent. He found that there were four or five hundred medical schools around this country, most of them very poor. The situation was absolutely critical.

Out of his study, he had two primary recommendations. First of all, he recommended a rigorous approach to assure the public that their physicians were highly competent; that doctors in America be encouraged to become "board certified" in their field of expertise. That was his first recommendation. Second, he recommended that the quality of medical education for doctors be sharply upgraded in this country. As all of us know, those things happened in America, and we came to have the finest doctors in the world and the highest quality of medical care in the world, coming directly from those key early decisions that made other things happen.

I would contend, Mr. Chairman, that this exactly—exactly—what is needed in America today with regard to education and teachers. The witnesses who are before you today—and we thank you for this opportunity to come and we thank both of you gentlemen for your superb leadership and that of Senator Pell and the others, including two of our Nation's most outstanding Governors—although Governor Orr is submitting his testimony—the heads of our national teachers organizations, Mary Futrell and Al Shanker, who give such wonderful leadership; top school administrator spokesmen, businessmen—are really representing something pretty amazing that has already happened. We do not come to you today with an idea that we hope will happen out there somewhere.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards exists today. For over two years we worked in trying to get this established. Governor Kean and I and others worked together. We came up with an idea, a recommendation by a distinguished national group that studied this. And then this board was established as a non-governmental entity, with a majority of teaching members but a full one-third membership of top public officials and private sector leaders such as Governor Kean; Dick Heckart, the CEO of the DuPont Company is a member of our board; David Kearns, the CEO of the Xerox Company; and top educators of all kinds throughout this country.

These public leaders are there to assure that the public interest is being served in the way that we go about this.

Now, the purpose of the board is very, very simple. It is to establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do. It is not enough just to know your subject matter. You have got to be able to teach it effectively, to motivate students in that process, and then to certify teachers who meet those high standards.

Mr. Chairman and Senator Stafford, I would just urge that we think just a moment about those top teachers that we had in our

lifetime. My mother was one of mine, I might add, but I had some others, people that really shaped our lives. We could tell anybody their names just like that, recall things that happened in their classroom. Those are the kinds of teachers this country has got to have, and we do not have enough of those kinds of people going into teaching today. Thank God we have had them in the past. We have got to make sure we have them in the future and even more of them.

Now, those top teachers, the ones that would come to our minds, would have been "board-certified" teachers had that been available in their time. We are talking about those kinds of teachers.

Now, while we want to talk about board certification to you today, I want to be very careful, as we begin, to distinguish this from the process of licensing. Now, that is a State Government function. It is to protect the people. It is a responsibility solely of the States. It involves at least minimum standards to make sure that people are not hurt. But we believe if we establish a board certification process, that a large portion of the 2.5 million teachers in this country today will ultimately seek that new and higher standard, that board certification that tells the world how good they are.

Now, if that happens, I believe we will see profound changes in America's educational system that this board certification will cause as sort of a catalytic agent. We are not coming to you today with a big, new, expensive, overpowering Federal program suggestion. We are coming with a suggestion about a way we can reach into a system with a very sharp instrument and change the way things work and have all kinds of things happen as a result.

These are four changes, gentlemen, that I believe we would see come about if we set up this certification process:

First of all, undergraduate programs and teacher education will have to be greatly strengthened to prepare teachers to meet these high standards. You simply, as an educational school, as a university, would know that if it was not superb, your teachers, your graduates would not be able to become "board certified." So you would have that pressure on you.

Number two, school restructuring to use good teachers in more challenging and productive ways will be absolutely necessary in order to attract certified teachers to come to a school or to come to a school system. These people are going to be desired. Everybody is going to want to hire them. So there is going to be pressure on the schools to make themselves more attractive places so they can hire these best teachers.

Third, the public will be assured that these teachers are top-flight, and I believe will be happy to pay these teachers more and provide more stimulating work environments for them. In other words, the schools will change in terms of the kinds of places they are, and the people, I think, will say—in fact, I think they will demand that their school boards and their schools hire these kinds of teachers.

The fourth thing, and this directly relates, Mr. Chairman, to your chart a while ago about the SATs: I am convinced that if we get this certification system in, we will then have a profession that will attract our share of the best and the brightest of American students. I want to see that line for students going into teaching be

not way below the average SAT. I want to see it above the average SAT, Mr. Chairman, and I think that really can happen.

Now, to make this a reality for America, we have got a huge task ahead. And we do not appear before you today naive about what we are about. We must develop standards, what teachers need to know and be able to do in the many different fields of instruction, and then develop valid assessments to measure whether or not teachers meet those standards.

I might add that there is no State today that is doing this kind of thing. We have States working with licensing. Again, those are fairly minimum kinds of standards. And, again, I might point out that the doctors have been working on this for 75 years now. We are here in 1988 starting very late trying to do this as quickly as we can, because we do not think the country can wait. We think we have got to do it quickly

I am convinced, as I said, that we can do it. We are determined to do it. We have top professional teachers and heads of major businesses and industries in this country. We have the unanimous support of America's Governors who went on record two years ago with regard to this. But it is going to take us three to five years, and it is going to be expensive. It is going to be expensive because we have got to do it well and we have got to do it soon.

We figure it will cost about $50 million of one-time, one-shot funds to do this job, to get these standards set and then develop the assessments to measure people to see if they meet them. Now, after that is done, the certification program, of course, will run on its own. Teachers who want to sit for these assessments will pay an application fee, and it will be a self-financing thing, as it is with other professions.

But now simply because these funds cannot be raised in any other way in the quick time that we think is essential, we propose that our national Government put up one-half of these funds—again, on a one-time, one-shot basis—one-half, $25 million, and that we match those funds with funds raised in the private sector from companies, foundations, State and local governments, perhaps from teachers themselves.

Now, all of the Federal Government funds would go to what has long been considered an appropriate endeavor for the Federal Government in the educational field, and that is research and development. That research and development will be available for use throughout this country. It is not something the board is going to get and hold on to; it is going to be available to every State, every local area, to teachers throughout America.

Now, while it is essential that this enterprise not be controlled by the Federal Government—and I think, frankly, that that is the worst thing that could happen in the eyes of the American people for this to be looked upon as a Federal Government takeover of teaching and deciding who is going to be teachers—we do understand the need to be fully accountable. And we want to say that to you today as strongly as we can, to you the Congress and to the American people, in several ways, regarding how the money is used and the results that will come from it.

I might say to you, as we begin today, that in addition to some steps I want to lay out to you, we think that the makeup of this

very board—having one-third public members, having Governor Tom Kean on it, having Scotty Campbell and these top CEOs and all of these people looking at what we are doing, people who know how to use money productively—we think that is one assurance that we will be accountable. But we suggest some other things:

First of all, that the board submit a report to the Congress each year with a comprehensive discussion of the operation's accomplishments and the financial conditions.

Second, that the accounts of the board be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by an independent certified public accountant, and that, of course, be presented to you, the Congress.

Third, that financial transactions of the board involving Federal funds be subject to the audit by the General Accounting Office.

Fourth, that the National Board produce an annual report detailing the work of the board available to the public. This is the substantive work that States and local governments and others would need to use.

Fifth, that the allocation of funds by the National Board conform to independently developed policies and procedures established by the board, including a merit review process to seek out the best research talent in this country.

Sixth, that the board establish a research and development advisory group, much as you do when you check to make sure the funds are spent wisely, of recognized scholars and experts in teaching and assessment, to advise the board on assessment and execution of overall research and development strategy.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we are proposing that there be real ways of determining that these moneys are being spent wisely. There is real beef here with respect to how we would make sure that these funds are used wisely.

Of course, there may be some other things that ought to be done. We are very open to that, Mr. Chairman. We suggest these; there may be other ways. But we must insist that this board be independent, that it be able to do its job with real integrity, that people know that it is a professional board, that is going to give us the top professional teachers.

Twenty-five million dollars is a lot of money—over three to five years, not at one time—but it pales in comparison to the $20 billion a year that the Congress is now spending. And the quality of those teachers out there across this country are really going to determine how well that $20 billion is being spent. I would say to you that the best thing we can do to make sure that $20 billion is being spent—and I hope there will be more in the future—is to make sure that those teachers are really excellent. And I think this is the most cost-efficient way in the world to do it.

Mr. Chairman, the opportunity that we urge on you I think is a very exciting one, and I hope and pray that Americans will grasp it right now. It will represent a truly national effort to, at this time, when America is thinking about what is happening in Calgary, a time for us to go for the gold in education, a way to do it and make sure we are going to have the best.

I want to pledge to you and the members of this Committee today on behalf of our 64-member board from all over this country

that if you join us as partners in the funding of this board, that we recognize the urgency of the problems you are dealing with. We are going to go out there and work our fingers to the bone, giving of our time and resources and finding all of the best people in America to work with us in this great national undertaking, finding those private resources. It is going to be tough to raise $25 million privately, very tough, but we are committed to do it. And we think if you help us take the lead, then we think the foundations and the companies will follow.

We simply want to say to you that if you will do this, if you will give us that kind of leadership and help, we promise you that in three to five years we will have a board certification process in place for America's teachers that will make you very proud, and that will renew your faith in the future of this Nation and our ability to compete in the world.

[The prepared statement of Governor Hunt follows:]

Statement of

James B. Hunt, Jr.

Governor of North Carolina, 1977 - 1985

Chair of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

To

Senate Labor and Human Resources
Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities

February 18, 1988

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Subcommittee, we much appreciate the opportunity you have provided us today to inform the Congress of the promise of the newly formed National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. This morning you will hear from a distinguished group of leaders from the American education community who believe that the Board can serve as a catalyst for improving the education of the nation's children. They also believe that the federal government can play a limited but important collaborative role in launching the Board on a successful course.

The Challenge Before Us

Our point of view is fairly straightforward. We sit at a critical juncture in the history of our country. After decades of unequaled prosperity and world leadership, the nation's future is in doubt. The best work that has been done in the past few years on this issue by both individuals and committees of scholars, business leaders, government officials and educators points over and over again to the importance of setting a new standard of accomplishment for our elementary and secondary schools. Whether the concern is economic, our nation's security, the health of our democratic institutions, the promise of an equal opportunity society or the quality of life for our citizens we return to this essential prescription. At the heart of all of these analyses one finds a strong emphasis placed on the quality of the teaching force.

Now, we have many excellent teachers throughout the country, but educating students in America's schools who can truly "think for a living" will require a teaching force that is superior to that which we have today. It will also require new work settings for teachers that respect and take advantage, in the best sense, of their professionalism. These teachers must teach successfully not just the old "four R's" with emphasis on rote learning. They must teach higher order cognitive skills so that all of our youngsters - not just a few trained to be managers and technical workers - will be more creative and productive. And they must do this at a time when more of the students they teach than ever before come from poor, broken homes and must struggle daily against pressure from their peers that suggests academic excellence is either beyond their grasp or unlikely to lead to a productive life.

These teachers must be very bright and have exceptional skills. They must bring to the classroom four qualities:

(1) a solid foundation in the liberal arts and sciences;

(2) a deep understanding of the subject matter they will teach;

(3) a solid grasp of teaching pedagogy (how to teach) and

content specific pedagogy (how to help youngsters come to understand a particular discipline); and

(4) a rich clinical experience that will have afforded them the opportunity to translate theory into practice with encouragement and counsel from an experienced mentor.

The Current State of Affairs

In no state in the nation today, do we adequately assure that our teachers have that knowledge and skill. States, which by law license teachers, do not assess teachers' knowledge and skills against truly high, rigorous and fair standards. Most of them now use a "test" of some kind to measure basic literacy. It is a minimum standard designed to assure the public that licensed teachers are unlikely to do any harm. Often amounting to little more than a reading comprehension test, such measures are not designed to assure a high level of competence.

This situation exists at a time in our country when large numbers of teacher retirements loom ahead and when women and minorities, historically the source of many of our best teachers, have unprecedented opportunities in other fields. If we are not vigilant, pressures to fill vacancies will result in less qualified teachers than we have today.

In the past when demand has shot up, there was always a large pool of women and minorities eager to enter the field, and if the pool was not deep enough we could always lower licensing standards, and we did. Now, for the first time, education will have to compete in the open market for talented individuals with many other choices. And, if we resort to lowering standards to fill our classrooms with warm bodies, at a time when standards ought to be raised, we will only be shooting our collective selves in the foot.

A New Approach

To help remedy this situation, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy established a Task Force on Teaching as a Profession chaired by Lewis M. Branscomb, then Chief Scientist at IBM. The Task Force report, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, recommended a set of interconnected principles and initiatives including: new school working environments that engage and challenge teachers with greater responsibilities and autonomy; improved teacher education programs to better prepare teachers for the increased demands for student learning that they will find in the schools; more competitive compensation arrangements that are coupled to demonstrated competence, level of responsibility and schoolwide performance; mobilization of the

nation's resources to attack the problem of the disappearing minority teacher; and higher standards for teachers to stimulate their continuing professional development and to provide a vehicle to recognize and reward teachers who have demonstrated the capacity to make independent professional judgments in an effective and principled manner.

This last recommendation, led to the establishment of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards on May 6, 1987. The Board is a 64 member non-profit, non-governmental entity, a majority of whose members are teachers, but with a full one-third of its membership drawn from the ranks of governors, state legislators, business and community leaders, local education officials and higher education administrators and faculty. Compared to other professional standards boards that typically have only token lay representation, this board distinguishes itself by virtue of the strong representation of public sector officials with responsibility for elementary and secondary education.

The purpose of the Board is to establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who meet those high standards. We believe that "Board certification" can and will come to mean as much to the public regarding teachers as it does in the case of doctors and other professionals.

While certification by the Board will be wholly voluntary (in contrast to state licensing which is mandatory), we believe that a large portion of America's two and one-half million teachers will ultimately seek to meet this new professional standard. This development will produce the following powerful side effects which will dramatically change our schools and upgrade the quality of the teacher workforce:

(1) Undergraduate arts and sciences and teacher eduction programs in our colleges will have to be strengthened to prepare teachers to meet the high standards required for certification.

(2) School restructuring will be necessary in order to attract "certified" teachers to a challenging, professional environment; and school boards and administrators will be able to have confidence that Board certified teachers can provide high quality instructional leadership for their schools.

(3) The public will be "assured" that these certified teachers are especially able and thus will be willing to pay them what they are worth and provide them with the kind of workplaces that professionals deserve.

(4) Many more of American's best and brightest students will be attracted to and remain in a teaching profession that is characterized by high standards, competitive pay and stimulating work environments.

While the National Board is now incorporated and beginning to develop its basic policies, its core task of setting standards and developing the assessments for certification will be difficult, time consuming and costly. The typical "multiple choice" or "true-false" tests currently in use will not suffice, for they often suggest that there is only one appropriate response to the wide variety of circumstances a teacher confronts. In fact, good practice tells us that the "right" approach is often conditioned on the mix of students in the class, the subject being taught, the age of the students, the time of the school year, and the teacher's own assessment of what approach suits his/her own particular strengths. Only by moving to assessment methodologies such as essays, interviews, simulations, interactive video and other leading edge technologies can we expect to assess accurately teachers' capacity to make sound professional judgments regarding the complex act of teaching.

The Board must, therefore, find the means to recognize and honor the diversity and pluralism of American education. It will do this not by endorsing one method of teaching or one approach to curriculum, but by designing standards and assessment processes that value a teacher's capacity to make independent and sound professional judgments, that recognize that in many circumstances there are multiple approaches to instruction that are appropriate and defensible, and that recognize that the circumstances themselves often call for vastly different teaching strategies.

One mark of a professional teacher is the ability to recognize which approach works best for each child. The novice has to rely on a single method; the seasoned professional has many.

We expect to assess candidates in at least three areas:

(1) on their knowledge and understanding of subject matter,

(2) on their grasp of generic pedagogy (e.g., classroom management, child development theory) and content specific pedagogy (e.g., how a biology teacher might approach the study of photosynthesis, including techniques for helping students who typically have problems coming to terms with this subject), and

(3) on observation of their actual teaching over a sustained period of time to determine how effectively they are able to put theory into practice.

We are plowing completely "new ground" and hope to compress into a few short years development of the kind of certification assessments that the medical profession has produced over 60 years. The nature of the work we have before us is as follows:

- In order to establish what teachers need to know and be able to do we will carefully examine the research literature to draw from it whatever it may offer along these lines. In some fields there is an emerging consensus on what makes for effective practice, in others there are either sharp controversies or insufficient evidence to draw firm conclusions.

- We will want to study the work of our best practitioners to understand the wisdom which makes their practice especially effective and then find ways to incorporate this new knowledge into our standards.

- We will need to convene experts from both the academy and the classroom to weigh all the evidence we are able to assemble and have them reach reasoned judgments on what teachers need to know and be able to do in each area in which the Board will issue certificates.

- For each set of standards that are developed compatible and reliable assessment processes have to be generated. In some respect this will be an iterative process; given standards will provoke a variety of assessment methodology options, but some standards may have to be modified or recast if the technology required to achieve satisfactory measures is either too costly or simply unavailable given the current state of the art.

- Cost and quality studies of alternate assessment practices will have to be undertaken in order that reasoned decisions can be made about the most appropriate approach to each standard and to determine the extent to which multiple measures of particular competencies are desirable or required.

- Practices in other professions will be studied for their efficacy and transportability to teaching. Methodologies employed by other nations may be explored as well. The prospect of wholly new methods for assessing teachers need to be tested. For example, the Board will probably be interested in exploring the viability of: candidates producing written critiques of other teachers viewed on video tape; interviews that probe how evidence presented in homework papers might govern future teaching decisions; oral defenses of textbook selection choices; written lesson plans developed in concert with other candidates; simulated

classroom situations with a small group of students and various combinations of all of these approaches.

- The feasibility of on-site clinical assessments needs to be studied as does the viability of teacher portfolios, a practice that has many positive attributes, but one that if not well constructed could be subject to fraud.

- Criteria for who will judge whether or not candidates for Board certification meet the standards will have to be developed and tested, and then training programs and quality control mechanisms created to insure that the judgments rendered by Board examiners are fair, reliable and just.

- Procedures to guard against bias of all sorts need to be generated and tested as do procedures to insure the reliability of the Board's instrumentation.

- The end products must be field tested and determined to be valid.

What is different about the Board's certification process is that it seeks not just to determine candidates' knowledge along a broad range of competencies, but it also seeks to determine candidates' capacity to apply this knowledge in an effective manner in a variety of school circumstances. This brief recitation of some of the major issues where the Board needs research and development work should serve to illustrate why the development costs of this new approach to teacher assessment extends substantially beyond what might typically be the case for a multiple choice test. The result, however, is a much richer and meaningful portrait of a teacher.

The Federal Role

The federal government has no business certifying teachers. But one very limited area of federal involvement is necessary because the problem of an inadequate workforce is national and the stakes for our nation are so high.

The National Board will need to invest approximately $50 million in a one-shot, one-time research and development activity to set the standards and design and validate the assessments for certification. We need the federal government's fiscal support in this endeavor, to be matched on a dollar for dollar basis by private corporations, foundations, state and local government and possibly teachers as well.

Once the assessments are developed and certification begins, the

Board will be self-financed by application fees, just as are certification activities in other professions.

It is not appropriate for the federal government to suggest the standards which the Board will set, or even to endorse the Board's standards. But in keeping with established tradition regarding an appropriate federal role in educational R&D, it is appropriate for the government to sponsor research that will enable the Board to make sound decisions on what the standards ought to be and how candidates are to be assessed.

As a former governor and state legislator, I appreciate the Congress' and the Executive Branch's need for accountability from recipients of government funds. If our request for research and development funds is positively received, we will want to be as accountable to the federal government for the management of such funds as we would be to any other contributor. In this regard we would suggest taking the following steps to insure a full measure of accountability is achieved by the Board:

- The Board will submit a Report to Congress each year. The Report will include a comprehensive and detailed discussion of the Board's operations, activities, financial conditions and accomplishments.

- The accounts of the Board will be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by an independent certified public accountant. The report of each independent audit will be included in the Annual Report.

- The financial transactions of the Board for any year that federal funds are available to finance any portion of the operation will be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office.

- The National Board will produce an Annual Report detailing the work of the Board. The Annual Report would include a message from the Chair and the President, and a financial statement and will be distributed to all of the Board's constituencies and made available to the public.

- The allocation of funds by the National Board will conform to independently developed policies and procedures established by the Board. These policies and procedures will include a merit review process to be designed by the Board whose overall objective will be to seek the best research talent available in the country.

- All federally supported grants and contracts in excess

of $100,000 will be subject to the merit review process. The Board will establish one or more merit review panels composed of distinguished scholars, teachers and others who possess qualifications relevant to the Board's activities to provide advice on these matters.

- The National Board will establish a Research and Development Advisory Group of recognized scholars and experts in teaching, assessment and other relevant fields to advise the Board on the design and execution of its overall research and development strategy, including procedures to assure the quality of the merit review process.

- The National Board will continually seek comments and advice from the education community and the public on the design and conduct of its research and development program.

- The National Board will broadly disseminate announcements of the Board's research program and assure that minority individuals and institutions receive special encouragement to participate in the Board's research and development activities.

- Committees of the Board will oversee the Board's research and development activities.

- Research reports prepared under grant or contract for the Board will be made available to the public, except where the release of a report might compromise the security of the Board's assessments.

- Congress and the Department of Education may wish to establish an independent advisory group that would review the Board's research and development program and issue public reports regarding it.

In addition to these various procedures and reporting arrangements, the accountability of the Board for its actions will be assured because:

- The Board will be accountable not only to the legislative and executive branch, but also to funders of all kinds -- private foundations, corporations -- and ultimately to the teachers of America and their employers.

- The Board has demonstrated its accountability by its composition. The Board is a unique organization that represents the coming together of all of the major

actors in American elementary and secondary education. Its unique status has prompted the endorsement of the nation's governors and the two national teachers' unions. All of these groups will be watching the Board to make sure that the standards that the Board develops are high, rigorous and fair. The assessments that the Board develops will, therefore, represent the work of professionals who insist on excellence.

In Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, as you listen to the fine group of witnesses you have assembled here today, think of the $20 billion investment the federal government currently invests in education. In the end, the return on the bulk of that investment is largely dependent on the quality of people who work on the front lines, the nation's teachers, and their capacity and engagement in directing the studies of the country's youth. While it is possible to produce marginal gains in the short term by taking new funds and adding them on to current allocations, a small one-time investment in the research and development work of National Board has the potential to return dramatic long term benefits to the country.

Like any new enterprise in search of venture capital to begin operations, we are the first to admit that there are risks to be considered. But this will not be the first time the federal government has been faced with something less than a sure thing. If we knew all the answers, we would not be here requesting support of our R&D program. But, we are exploring uncharted territory. I am not sure if the right parallel is the Manhattan Project, AIDS research, the GI Bill or Head Start. In each, the nation identified a compelling need and decided to act without any guarantees that the new program would succeed.

I think we have made an auspicious start in assembling the Board and reaching agreement on the governance structure that represents a rare compact of often competing interests in American education. As we move to commence our research and development activities, I am equally confident that we can draw on the nation's best minds from the academy, the schools, government and the business community to get this right and produce standards and assessment processes of which we can all be proud.

I have started a number of new enterprises during my years of public service, but I can think of none that might have a longer lasting and more positive impact than this new Board which I call to your attention today.

Thank you very much for convening this hearing. I look forward to working with you and your colleagues in the months ahead to fashion a legislative approach that meets the Congress' priorities and is compatible with our own. I would be pleased to respond to any questions you or your colleagues on the committee may have.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Governor Hunt, for your excellent testimony.

Governor Kean, we welcome you here this morning. Delighted you are with us.

I would point out Senator Thurmond has joined us but we will go through our witnesses. Then the Senator may have some comments.

Governor KEAN. Mr. Chairman, Senator Stafford, Senator Thurmond, this is not the first time that we have searched together for ways to improve our schools. And I suspect it will not be the last time. I am very grateful for this invitation to speak before this distinguished committee.

We have pursued our task together, and we have seen we cannot look at education for the one right thing to do, for there are many. American education gets better because we together are persisting on many, many fronts.

And yet every so often, those of us in elective office face what I think of as a special opportunity to fulfill our commitment to the people. As Governor, I faced it recently with legislation that enabled me to intervene in districts that year after year just were not educating kids. You face it, I know, in the reauthorization of Chapter 1.

There are not many such opportunities. We seize them when they appear because effective action in the right place at the right time is what we owe to those who elect us.

When we wage these long struggles, we know that we are not solving all the problems, but we surely know we are solving some of them. And we know that what we do endures.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, I believe, is that kind of an opportunity. I value the National Board because I am absolutely convinced that teaching must become more attractive as a calling, and teaching has to be more effective as a profession. As Governor, I have done everything I can think of, as have other governors, to achieve those ends, better training, higher State licensing standards, professional pay levels, incentives of every sort that we have been able to think of, recognition for outstanding performances. Governors in a number of States have won all of these things.

I value the National Board because I share with it an intense interest in higher teaching standards. Licensing teachers is a fundamental State responsibility, and standards are at the heart of it. A teaching license is the State's guarantee to the public that a teacher possesses at least the basic competence to enter the classroom.

But State action alone will never make teaching that much more attractive or that much more effective. State action alone cannot create a profession, and the assurance of basic competence provided by a State license is not enough.

Teachers will have to do something, too. Teachers themselves will have to embrace the very highest standards of professional performance. I believe they will, if they are full partners in defining those standards. The National Board makes that offer.

The Nation's Governors endorsed the concept of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in their own education report, "Time For Results." I am delighted that Governor Orr has

submitted testimony today. He was very much a part of that report.

Later this month, the National Governors' Association will publish another report entitled "Getting Ready for the National Board." It describes what governors can do right now to make sure that their States can seize whatever opportunities are presented by the board. In lieu of written testimony, I am providing the committee a copy of that manuscript.

As a member of the planning group that formed this board, and later as a member of the board, one thing I have watched for very closely is assurances of quality and integrity, for what the board does. It is the same issue that I think in Congress you have often called "accountability" in your work on Chapter 1, and the same issue the governors had in mind when we called our report "Time For Results."

I wanted to make sure that the board did not intrude in State or local matters. How we license and hire teachers are our own state and local concerns. But we are eager for advice on how to improve what we are able to do in the States.

I wanted to make sure that the board would not be the creature of any one constituency, any one small group of interests. This board has to respond to the need of the wide variety of Americans who are demanding better education today.

I am satisfied now on these points. I am satisfied because of the quality of the people that serve on this board. I was on the panel that searched for candidates for initial membership on the board, and we recruited some of the most distinguished leaders in business, in Government, education and from so many other facets, and leaders of the American public. I am satisfied also because of quality of the leaders of the board and because of the rigorous agenda the board has adopted.

I appreciate very deeply the need that the Congress and this committee have to be satisfied as well. Let me suggest some concepts that you can provide in your legislation, Senator Dodd, that would help ensure the quality and the integrity of the board.

I think it is important, very, very important, as Jim Hunt just said, that the board be independent and accountable. These are both key words. It cannot be a Federal board just as it cannot be a teacher's board. It cannot be an educator's board. It must make its decisions openly, using the best research that it has available, and then be responsible to everybody through comprehensive reporting and comprehensive auditing.

The board must be accountable to teachers, to the local boards who hire teachers, to the people who pay the costs of education, to private contributors, to elected officials. And, of course, Senators, the board must be accountable to you.

It is important that the board match every dollar of research funds that are provided by the Federal Government. It is important that any research conducted by the board be done on the basis of a merit review of proposals, and that proposals be sought from everywhere, every possible source. It is important that the results of the board's research be published, not just for the board's use but for public benefit and also for public scrutiny.

And it is very important for the Federal Government to invest in this enterprise just as you have traditionally invested in the most significant research and development efforts in every field that is important to the public as a whole.

There are few opportunities, I believe, to achieve so much with really so conservative an investment.

Will the States invest in this, too? In a sense, we already have. Connecticut and California have a notable joint venture to share the costs of putting into practice the concepts that drive this board. A number of other States are watching what they do.

I tend to think that the States will invest more directly in the work of the board in the future. Our stake in teacher standards and our recognition that the teaching career has to be rethought compels our interest in just what the board is doing. The very high cost of this work will force us to find ways to share this burden.

The National Board is a very significant enterprise, but it has got to have steadfast partners to make it work. It already has many partners, but it needs the Federal partner also. I would, therefore, urge your support for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

[The prepared statement of Governor Kean follows:]

84-356 0 - 88 - 2

DRAFT

GETTING READY
FOR THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

What A Governor Can Do

Submitted by

Thomas H. Kean
Governor of New Jersey

in lieu of written testimony
to the

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
of the
Committee on Labor and Human Resources

February 18, 1988

Publication anticipated in March

National Governors' Association
Center for Policy Research
Results in Education Series

DRAFT 2/18/88

GETTING READY

FOR THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

Governors supported the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in our education report, Time For Results, and again in the sequel, Results in Education, 1987. Now the board has begun its work. Is there more we should do? I think so.

Clearly, we need not wait for the national board. There is much we can do to strengthen teaching. Time for Results presented ten ideas, and many of us have already acted on that list. This booklet suggests other actions that will enable a state to keep pace with change and to be ready when the national board standards appear.

But while we won't wait for the national board, there are reasons why we should work with it. Governors are interested in the national board because we share an interest in teacher standards. Licensing teachers is a fundamental state responsibility and standards are at the heart of it. A teaching license is the state's guarantee to the public that a teacher possesses the basic competence to enter the classroom. We take that seriously.

We also know that a state school system's reputation depends on attracting and keeping able teachers. Recruitment depends on

standards, too. Recruitment depends on our ability to present teaching as a professional opportunity in every respect. But state action alone cannot create a profession.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is concerned not with the state function of teacher licensing, but with voluntary professional certification. Most professions have such a standards board; until May 1987, teaching did not. Professional certification demands a level of competence far higher than that possessed by the licensed beginner. Board certification will be different from state licensing. State licensure will continue as a prerequisite for teaching, while professional board certification will offer an option to teachers who would like to be recognized for what they know and can do as first class practitioners. Both will exist in parallel as they do in most other professions.

The national board represents a major opportunity for teachers to join with state and local policymakers to set the professional standards for teaching. It represents a major opportunity for the states because it provides a system to recognize and advance the professional talent of teachers, as well as access to better assessment techniques. Governors can help seize this opportunity.

Thomas H. Kean
Governor of New Jersey
Chairman, NGA Task Force on Teaching, 1985-86
Member, National Board for Professional
Teaching Standards

What is the National Board?

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is a nongovernmental, not-for-profit board with 64 members. A majority are teachers, including leaders in teacher unions and subject area associations, and teachers noted for excellence in the classroom. Among the other members are school administrators and local board members, former and current state Governors, teacher educators, children's advocates, and business leaders.

What unites them is an effort to answer two fundamental questions: What should professional teachers know? What should professional teachers be able to do? In short, they will develop high, rigorous, and fair standards for teaching and create ways to determine when candidates meet those standards.

The national board will not only develop professional standards in the major subject areas, but also a system to offer voluntary professional certification to those who meet the standards. It is important for teachers to embrace those professional standards, and they probably will if they can help design them.

Why is the national board so important? Americans need to be much better educated than they are today. That will require great teaching and schools that encourage and develop teachers' talents. Effective teaching is complex and difficult. People who are good at it know and can do things that the rest of us are not aware of. It is time to make these things explicit to both the profession and

the public. Doing so will raise the status of teaching and help schools attract and keep able teachers. It will support teachers' efforts to develop professionally. It will help schools become more effective. It will make it possible to reinvent schools for modern times.

What is the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Doing Now?

The national board will not issue the first certificate to a teacher for several years, but a lot of careful thinking about policy must be done now. Here is a summary of the board's agenda:

- **What Will Certified Teachers Represent?** What kind of knowledge and skill will they have? Will they be deeply educated themselves? Will they understand how children learn? Will they care deeply about all children? Will they balance knowledge of their subject with their skill in conveying that knowledge?

- **What Should the Basic Structure of the Certificates Be?** Should there be one certificate, or more than one representing different levels of skill and knowledge? And in what subjects should the board offer certificates? Or would an entirely different kind of structure work better? Should certificates recognize different age levels of students, or might there be a certificate that

recognizes skill and knowledge common to all teachers, with an additional component to recognize what is particular to one area or subject?

- **How High Will Those Standards Be?** Will they be attainable by all teachers once they become proficient or will they be attainable only by a few experts?

- **How Will Candidates Show That They Meet the Standards?** There may be a combination of ways to do this, including a general test of knowledge in the liberal arts and sciences, presentation of a portfolio of various kinds of work, completion of a series of exercises in an assessment center, and a residency in a school. Each of these components raises complex problems of policy and design. For example, what test of liberal arts would they use? What would an assessment center for teaching do?

  What kind of residency program would suffice, and how would a school oversee it? The national board will soon begin to design the research program needed to develop the assessment system. The national board will have the benefit of research funded by Carnegie Corporation of New York at Stanford University and a number of other institutions.

- **What is the Connection Between Board Certification and Teacher Education?** Teacher education is changing too, partly because of action in the states and partly because

of changes within the teacher education community. Should the certificate represent completion of a particular type of program? Some say yes, while others want to encourage alternative approaches to teacher education. Some relationship between the certificate and teacher educators is inevitable. In the years ahead, a program whose graduates could not attain the professional certificate would have trouble finding students. In many more subtle ways, teacher education will influence the standards of the board and vice versa.

- o **How Will the Teacher Assessment System Reach the Teachers?** Clearly, there will have to be some kind of regional or state level capacity to assess candidates for the certificate. Just as clearly, the board will have to decide how to ensure that the standards are consistent throughout.

What Governors Can Do to Make the Most of This Opportunity

If these questions get the answers they deserve, Governors will be measurably closer to their goals for school reform in the states. Governors should recognize this agenda for the opportunity it is. Here is what a Governor can do:

1. **Tell the Board What You Think.**

   The board's agenda is known. State experience is relevant. The list of national board members is at the

end of this booklet. Tell board members what you think about the agenda items and encourage other education leaders in the state to do the same.

To be ready to do this, start a discussion in your own state. People already have some basic questions that should be out in the open: Will the national board preempt state teacher license standards? No, that is not its purpose. Will it water down state standards? No. Will their standards be unrealistic? Tough, but attainable. Could they be used to redesign school staffing arrangements and the teaching career itself? Probably. Talk about these things and then talk to board members.

Get the message out that you would value the certificate <u>if</u> it is rigorous. Call on teachers and others to help the board make it so.

2. <u>What NOT To Do.</u>

Major change is in the wind for teacher standards, and not just because of what the national board is doing. States have been forces for change too. Existing teacher licensing practices, which are based on completing particular courses and scores on paper and pencil tests, are becoming obsolete.

Still, the shape of what will replace current standards is unclear. Don't put things on hold, but don't do what will have to be undone soon. Encourage state licensing bodies to avoid hard positions. Now is not the time, for example, to enhance lifetime licenses. And don't make the board certificate a prerequisite for a state license. The courts have applied a specific standard to tests used as the basis for the teacher license: Does the test measure what candidates now learn in teacher education? Does it test what they now use in the classroom? The court standard rests on the status quo. A forward-looking teacher certificate wouldn't pass that court standard. For the new certificate to work, it has to be voluntary.

Don't confuse "license" and certificate." When people misunderstand these terms, the discussion falters. License and certificate refer to different spheres of action to build teacher capacity -- one is the concern of the states and the other the concern of the profession. One is a minimum standard that protects the public against incompetence and the other will be the mark of a seasoned, highly skilled professional. Solid and related work needs to be done in both areas in order to get and keep the schools the public wants.

3. Look for Obstacles in State Regulations and Practices.

Do state regulations encourage or discourage teacher educators and state licensing authorities to think anew about teaching standards? Are the current systems rigid or flexible? Is there more than one way to complete teacher training in your state? Do funding systems or state reviews of teacher programs tend to lock teacher educators into the current way of doing things? Or do they encourage innovation?

Who gets appointed to state panels and boards responsible for teacher standards? Are they aware of the national debate and willing to participate in it, or are they certain of one "best" approach and closed to all others?

Even if your state just completed a major improvement in teacher licensing standards, think ahead to the next step. Look beyond the state teacher test, if one exists, and think about other ways to foster teacher professionalism, such as the use of peer reviews or supervised internships.

Demand teacher licensing that is based on performance in the classroom, not just completion of certain courses. Support collaborative approaches that involve state education officials, local educators, and higher education.

4. **Challenge Teacher Educators, and Back Challenges with Money.**

Meet with the entire teacher education community, and that includes arts and science faculty and presidents, as well as the education faculty and deans. Ask what they are doing to make sure the graduates of their programs can meet the national standards, if they choose to do so. Will teacher educators be ready to help veteran teachers who wish to prepare for the certificate? Many experienced teachers won't need that kind of support, but some will.

Do teacher preparation programs stress subject matter as well as how to teach it? Do they provide extensive supervised experience in schools as part of the training? Do schools of education engage the best teachers in the redesign of teacher preparation? Are teacher educators ready to check the curriculum to make sure it covers the topics covered by the developing certificates? Does the state provide financial incentives and the flexibility to the teacher educators to respond to these questions?

Offer to deregulate teacher education, but insist on greater quality in return, and be specific. Abandon the idea of one acceptable "state" teacher education curriculum. Then back the colleges that try to develop strong alternatives and are ready to show results.

Whatever shape the certificate takes, part of the assessment is sure to involve a candidate presenting evidence of having met the standards. Encourage the colleges to think through how that evidence can be presented. And ask them to tell the board.

Some states license teachers who have completed training programs that are alternatives to the regular college teacher education approach. Make sure that the alternate route candidates will be equipped to get the board certificate, if they want to. This may require providing opportunities for continued study.

5. <u>Enlist the Help of the School Boards.</u>

Local board members and administrators, not Governors, hire teachers. But Governors can set the stage. Talk to local leaders about this most important decision. Ask them to think hard about the kind of teachers they are recruiting. And make it clear that they are accountable for the performance of students. Then make sure they see the connection between student performance and teacher professionalism.

Ask school boards to think about how they can create opportunities for veteran teachers to prepare to meet the national board standards.

In the future, board-certified teachers will be sought eagerly by local boards of education. Anticipate the equity problems that may result if wealthy districts are able to recruit large numbers of these teachers, while poor districts cannot.

6. **Make Sure the School Approval Process Supports Teaching and Learning.**

States need to address the quality of schools, whether they call it accountability, district monitoring, or school approval. The fundamental purpose, of course, is to assure the quality of instruction. But school approval is also related to teacher recruitment and retention. The things that make a school work for students -- a focus on learning, visionary leadership, strong support from the community -- are also things that make a school attractive to professional teachers. Look at the state school approval system from this perspective. Does it tend to create and sustain schools that put the abilities of outstanding teachers to work for the students, or is the reform process really an obstacle to efforts to improve teaching?

7. **Urge Teachers to Go for It!**

Teachers have lots of questions about the national board. Create opportunities for them to ask their

questions and get answers. Experienced teachers, for example, have asked why they would need board certification. One way to answer that is to point out that teacher opinion surveys indicate that teachers want opportunities to develop as professionals. Board certification provides such an opportunity.

Teachers also ask why they have to take a "test." The answer, of course, is that they don't. Board assessment will not be a conventional paper and pencil test, but an exacting review of professional knowledge and skills that will include many different kinds of assessments. And it will be voluntary.

Teachers will need time to think about the certificate. Governors can begin the discussion with them. Challenge teachers to prepare themselves to lead their own profession by joining their colleagues on the board. If your state has an institute to support teachers' efforts to continue their own professional training, look for ways that it can help teachers who want to prepare for the assessment.

8. <u>Find Out Whether Minority Teacher Recruitment Efforts Are Working.</u>

The schools are not attracting their fair share of well trained minority Americans. Look first at the

minority recruitment and graduation figures in your state's colleges, regardless of major. Ask state higher education authorities to confront these results. Ask them how they plan to make the results better.

Recruit teachers yourself, and make sure that recruiting message is heard everywhere. Then make sure that people who hear, can act. Create tuition assistance programs for teachers. Look at the pass rates for minorities on teacher license tests. Ask teacher educators what they are doing to make sure that more minorities are prepared for the license standards. Keep the standards high and search for ways to help more people meet them. But make sure the license standards make sense.

9. <u>Confront the Organization Problems of Schools, and Encourage Others to Help.</u>

Professional teachers, board-certified teachers, won't remain in schools that do not allow them to use their training and capabilities. Most observers agree that today's school doesn't work as well as it could for the students or the teachers. The effort to redesign schools must work in concert with the redesign of the teaching profession.

-15-

Too many American schools are characterized by conflict over matters of instructional policy that could be more effectively resolved through collaboration. This atmosphere of conflict shapes practices of labor, management, and public agencies, as well as the structure of policies and the overall climate of the school. The result is an unstated determination to try nothing new in times that cry out for a new approach.

Some American schools reflect an older view of work, one that depended on close supervision of largely routine work by a largely unwilling and unskilled work force. If this was ever true of schools, it is certainly not true of high-performing schools today, nor can it be true of the schools that will have to be commonplace in the years ahead. But watch out for the notion that there is one best way to run a school, even in the reform movement. There have to be many ways to run a school that works for students.

Board-certified teachers will expect to work in schools that recognize their greater knowledge and competence. They will expect to be involved in decisions about curriculum, discipline, scheduling, and other matters that affect the performance of their students. They will demand professional development opportunities that far outstrip what we call "in-service training" today. They will expect the opportunity for greater

compensation without having to leave the classroom to work as administrators. And they will expect to find building management that is just as competent and professional as they are.

Governors can prepare the way for these teachers and the more effective schools children need. Create pilot projects and learn from the experience, stimulate local experimentation, look for obstacles in state regulations. Challenge the boards, unions, administrators, and teachers to join state policymakers in inventing more productive school organizations.

Members of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
1987-1988

James B. Hunt, Jr. - Chair
Poyner & Spruill
Raleigh, NC

James A. Kelly - President
National Board for
Professional Teaching
Standards
Detroit, MI

Mary-Dean Barringer
Resource Demonstration Teacher
Wayne County Public Schools
Wayne, MI

Lewis M. Branscomb
Professor of Public Service
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA

Alan K. Campbell
Vice-Chairman and Exec.
Vice President
ARA Services
Philadelphia, PA

Iris Carl
Elementary Mathematics
Instruction Specialist
Houston Independent
School District #14
Houston, TX

Ivy H. Chan
Special Education Teacher
Garfield Elementary School
Olympia, WA

James P. Comer
Professor, School of Medicine
Yale University
New Haven, CT

Ernesto J. Cortes, Jr.
National Staff Member
Industrial Areas Foundation
Southwest Branch
Austin, TX

Joseph D. Delaney
Principal
Spartanburg Senior
High School
Spartanburg, SC

Martha F. Dolfi
Teacher/Clinic Leader
Brookline Elementary
Teachers Center
Pittsburgh, PA

Karen Dreyfuss
Director
Dade-Monroe Teacher
Education Center
Miami Springs, FL

Jaime Escalante
Mathematics Teacher
Garfield High School
Los Angeles, CA

Joel Aaron Fink
Biology Teacher
Oldham County High School
Buckner, KY

Norman C. Francis
President
Xavier University of Louisiana
New Orleans, LA

Clifford L. Freeman
Attorney
Metropolitan Public
Defenders
Portland, OR

E.K. Fretwell, Jr.
Chancellor
University of North Carolina
at Charlotte
Charlotte, NC

Charleyne A. Gilbert
Business Education Teacher
Westbrook High School
Westbrook, ME

Richard E. Heckert
Chairman & Chief Executive
Officer
Du Pont Company
Wilmington, DE

Shirley A. Hill
Professor of Education
& Mathematics
University of Missouri -
Kansas City
Kansas City, MO

Bill Honig
Superintendent of Public
Instruction
State Department of Education
Sacramento, CA

Nancy L. Jewell
Vice President
Oklahoma Education Association
Oklahoma City, OK

Vera Katz
Speaker of the House
Oregon House of Representatives
Salem, OR

David T. Kearns
Chairman & Chief Executive
Officer
Xerox Corporation
Stamford, CT

Judith E. Lanier
Dean, College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI

Mary Hatwood Futrell
President
National Education
Association
Washington, DC

Barbara R. Hatton
Program Officer
Ford Foundation
New York, NY

Sonia Hernandez
Teaching Principal
Emma Frey Elementary
School
San Antonio, TX

Patricia C. Hodges
Interlanguage Core
Curriculum Consultant
Roy Martin Junior High
School
Las Vegas, NV

Sue Hovey
Gifted Program Teacher
and Coordinator
Moscow High School
Moscow, ID

Susan Adler Kaplan
Advanced Placement English
Teacher
Classical High School
Providence, RI

Thomas H. Kean
Governor of New Jersey
Trenton, NJ

Nathaniel H. LaCour, Jr.
President
United Teachers of New
Orleans
New Orleans, LA

Peggy J. Lathlaen
Teacher Consultant
Friendswood, TX

Esther S. Lauderman
Kindergarten Teacher
Waverly Elementary School
Waverly, WV 26184

Barbara B. Laws
Itinerant Art Teacher
Ocean Air & Ocean View
Elementary Schools
Norfolk, VA

Katherine P. Layton
Mathematics Teacher
Beverly Hills High School
Beverly Hills, CA

Hayes A. Lewis
Superintendent
Zuni Public Schools
Zuni, NM

Susan M. Lloyd
History & Music Teacher
Phillips Academy
Andover, MA

A. Robert Lynch
Social Studies Teacher
Jericho High School
Jericho, NY

Helen E. Martin
Earth & Space Science Teacher
Unionville High School
Unionville, PA

Deborah Meier
Director
Central Park East
Secondary School
New York, NY

Damon P. Moore
President
Indiana State Teachers
Association
Indianapolis, IN

James R. Oglesby
Director of Facilities
Utilization
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO

Patrick F. O'Rourke
President
Hammond Teachers' Federation
Hammond, IN

Rebecca Ann Palacios
Bilingual Pre-Kindergarten
Teacher
Zavala Special Emphasis
School
Corpus Christi, TX

Thomas W. Payzant
Superintendent
San Diego Unified School
District
San Diego, CA

Claire L. Pelton
Supervisor of Curriculum &
English Teacher
San Jose Unified School
District
San Jose, CA

Ruth E. Randall
Commissioner of Education
State of Minnesota
St. Paul, MN

Doris D. Roettger
Area Coordinator
Heartland Area Education
Agency #11
Johnston, IA

Leonard Rovins
Partner
Summitt, Rovins & Feldesman
New York, NY

Mary Budd Rowe
Professor of Science
Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL

Franklin D. Schlatter
English Teacher
Roswell High School
Roswell, NM

Phillip C. Schlechty
Executive Director
Gheens Professional
Development Academy
Jefferson County Public
Schools
Louisville, KY

Thomas F. Sedgwick
Mathematics Teacher
Lincoln High School
Tacoma, WA

Albert Shanker
President
American Federation of
Teachers
Washington, DC

Susan A. Stitham
English Teacher
Austin E. Lathrop
High School
Fairbanks, AK

Edith Swanson
Sixth Grade Teacher
Edmonson Middle School
Ypsilanti, MI

Peggy Swoger
English Teacher
Mountain Brook Junior
High School
Birmingham, AL

Irene Phelps Thorman
Coordinating Teacher
Occupational Work Adjustment
& English as a Second
Language
Winthrow High School
Cincinnati, OH

Vicki K. Turano
Middle School Language Arts
Teacher
St. Rose of Lima School
Denver, CO

Adam Urbanski
President
Rochester Teachers
Association
Rochester, NY

Reg Weaver
Science & Health Teacher
Brooks Junior High School
Harvey, IL

Terry L. Wyatt
High School Physics &
Consulting Teacher
Toledo Public Schools
DeVilbiss High School
Toledo, OH

OFFICES

333 West Fort Street
Suite 2070
Detroit, MI 48226
313-961-0830

1320 18th St., NW
Suite 401
Washington, DC 20036
202-463-3980

Acknowledgements

Many individuals assisted in preparing this pamphlet, and their contributions are deeply appreciated. Many people suggested valuable ideas for what Governors might do: Gordon Ambach, Tom Duncan, Pascal Forgione, David Imig, Leo Klagholz, Susan Kaplan, Robert Lynch, David Mandel, Thomas Payzant, Sharon Robinson, Bella Rosenberg, Phillip Schlechty, Gary Sykes, and Marc Tucker. Governor Kean thanks his colleagues on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and Board President James Kelly for use of material related to the board's future work. The following people at the National Governors' Association contributed in numerous ways by reviewing drafts and ensuring the timely publication of the pamphlet: Dean Honetschlager, Susan Traiman, Michael Cohen, Mark Miller, and Rae Young Bond. Finally, Richard Mills managed this project and compiled the report.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Governor.

Mr. Kelly, I know you are here as an adviser, and that you do not have a prepared statement, but if you would care to make a comment, proceed.

Mr. KELLY. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you, and my function is simply to be available for questions if there are any at the conclusion of the testimony.

Thank you.

Senator DODD. Ms. Kaplan, again, we welcome you. As an English major in college, I am intimidated a little bit by your being here.

Ms. KAPLAN. I certainly have to watch to see that I split no infinitives.

I thank you, Senator Dodd, Senator Stafford, Senator Thurmond. It is my first time appearing before a congressional committee to testify. I am grateful to have the opportunity to give you my perspectives as a classroom teacher for 27 years.

That is a long time, and I have seen many education reform suggestions come and go. I have embraced some; I have responded to others, but no report has been so compelling to me and to my colleagues as those recommendations from "A Nation Prepared." The concept of a National Board to certify teachers is dramatic. The Board will set high standards for assessing what we know and need to do in our classrooms, as some of us face 150 different learners in the course of a six-hour day.

What does it mean to the teachers with whom I teach? I am going to focus on three groups: those of us veterans and certainly we are veterans—I speak for myself and many of my colleagues—whose average age is mid- to late-40's. Many are thinking about retirement. They are effective teachers. We do not want them to go. We want this Board to be a means by which veteran teachers can be reinvigorated, rejuvenated. For me this is a new beginning. It challenges me to respond and to demonstrate what I know and what I can do.

The second group I will focus on are the younger teachers. Within the first seven years of teaching, 50 percent of new teachers leave. I can count on my own faculty, teachers who have gone into computer science, real estate, corporate training and development, finance, and public relations fields. Many of them say they miss teaching, but they felt they were not valued sufficiently, and that they did not have the opportunity to make educational decisions.

We have all heard of "top down" administration. But, now, we are embarking on an experience, an opportunity where there can be partnerships. As I sat on the Planning Group for the National Board, I met with people with competing interests: representatives of the two teachers' unions, representatives of State legislatures, State education officers, teachers, principals, superintendents, and we have put together a Board of 64 people. I marvel as I attend meetings and look around the table that I see that everyone, in fact, is a partner; that we are all looking to the future of the education of the young people who are going to run our nation. And I am concerned about the 21st century. I am concerned about losing those outstanding, promising young teachers within their first seven years.

Another group for whom I find the National Board so exciting are my students today. Not only the students in my high school classrooms and in my system, but also those from another perspective of mine, and that is as a trustee of Brown University. I frequently speak to students on campus. One of the most compelling, sad, yet forceful tales I have to recount. A student came back from Christmas break, and he said, "You know, Mrs. Kaplan, I spent my whole break convincing my parents that I want to be a teacher." And I have heard this from students in other schools, too—State schools, private schools. This young man explained, "My parents said, 'We did not send you to college to be *just* a teacher.' "

I submit to you now, the time has come for us to elevate the profession and give it the dignity and the prestige and the value that honors those complex decisions and judgments that we make in our classrooms every day. We know we are professionals. One of my colleagues expressed it best when she said, "I know I am a professional, but I am not sure I am in a profession."

The National Board will allow her to say she is a professional-with portfolio. It is very important. I must also conclude the young man's tale. I said to him, "Go back. Tell your parents; tell your friends, we want the best and brightest in teaching. We will support you. We are going to offer you the opportunity through sophisticated state-of-the-art assessments to attest to what you do every day in creating curriculum, in making those decisions, to provide you with workplaces that value you, that listen to you, that allow you the complete participation of demonstrating your skills."

The National Board promises all of that and more. The National Board will allow us to take educational ideals and make them educational realities.

For example, I have kept a journal of my teaching for many, many years. I would like to share some of the wisdom that I have accumulated. I hope it is wisdom. As I look at the success rate of some of my students, I hope I have reached many of them. I will urge my students, my minority students, my Asian students, my students from disadvantaged homes to join me in a true profession. And that is the importance. Our schools can no longer continue the way they are, letting good teachers leave and looking at career decisions of our students that say: No, I am not going to be *just* a teacher.

I invite my students now to join me in a truly distinguished profession. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. It has been a privilege to share my views with you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Kaplan follows:]

Testimony by Susan Adler Kaplan

before the

Senate Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee

on

Education, Arts and Humanities

February 18, 1988

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

My name is Susan Adler Kaplan. I am an English teacher at Classical High School in Providence, Rhode Island, a charter member of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and a Trustee of Brown University. I am grateful to have the opportunity to appear before you today to speak in support of funding for research and development for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

My remarks will focus on the importance of the National Board to current teachers and to those young men and women whom we hope to attract to the teaching profession. I have been teaching for twenty-seven years and have worked with student teachers for at least twenty of those years. Currently, I lead a collaborative research group studying issues in student teaching. The teacher educators, teachers and student teachers working in this group believe that the work of the National Board will provide us with valuable insights into the core capacities that make for good

teaching.

As you know, the establishment of the National Board is the cornerstone recommendation of the landmark report, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. In my career, I have experienced many challenges to our education system and responded to many heralds. No proposal has generated as much lively debate or offered such cogent arguments for strengthening teaching as a profession and improving the quality of education in our schools as has the National Board.

In my own state, for example, the Carlin Commission, a joint legislative group, is studying the recommendations of the report. Following the National Board's lead, legislators, along with teachers, principals, superintendents, administrators, union leaders, state education officers, parents, and members of the business community -- all of whom have a stake in the education of Rhode Island's children -- are discussing this timely issue and its impact on the state.

While I served on the Planning Group to establish the Board, I was keenly aware that we were working to design a profession that offers promise of increased recognition and prestige through fair and appropriate methods of assessment. The Board's mission to develop certification policies, set high and rigorous standards, and create reliable assessment processes demands our attention

and support. We must move forward quickly and efficiently.

How do teachers view the National Board? Initial responses from my peers to the Board's challenge of making teaching a true profession are poignant in their urgency. Teachers understand that we must provide a quality of education for all children that differs from the past, and my teaching colleagues want to respond to that challenge. Their first question consistently is, "When will the Board begin certifying teachers?" "Where do I go to sit for the assessment?" The meaning is clear; teachers are eager to attest to their skills. They want professional workplaces with time for colloquy, and they are ready to assume more responsibility than ever before to prove what they know and are able to do.

One educator aptly said that the professional teacher has been around for a long time, but the profession has not. Another colleague says that she knows she is a professional -- but without portfolio. Board certification promises her that portfolio. It summons her to demonstrate her flexibility and adaptability in a variety of teaching situations. Every day she makes both thoughtful judgments and quick decisions in her classroom. She should have the same opportunities for exercising those judgments in her school, in an environment which encourages collegial decision-making.

In choosing to become Board certified, she will participate in a careful assessment of her teaching that will examine her subject matter knowledge and her knowledge of how to teach that subject to a variety of children, her understanding of curriculum, educational goals and general pedagogy. When she sits for the Board, she will be assessed using state-of-the-art techniques that move beyond the current teacher tests. She may be asked to document her teaching methods, or conduct a lesson of choice before expert practitioners. In developing our assessments, the National Board will examine what successful teachers do, drawing from our best practitioners the skills and knowledge and habits of mind that make for effective teaching.

Furthermore, we in education are hopeful that the creation of the National Board will spur the development of work environments in which we can adapt, adjust and create curricula and teaching methods which are appropriate for our increasingly diverse student population. We look to the Board to assist us in turning educational ideals into educational realities. A Board certificate must be more than a piece of paper. It can become a powerful summons to education decision-makers to provide environments capable of accommodating new and more productive roles and activities for teachers.

Board certification has the potential to lead to a redefinition of teachers' responsibilities. For example, the Board certified

teacher may become a mentor. She may provide leadership for her colleagues by demonstrating new teaching methods, evaluating the latest instructional materials or organizing instruction. She may develop peer evaluation projects. She may work with principals, superintendents, school board members and parents on innovative projects. In short, she will have varied opportunities as a teacher. She will not have to leave teaching to demonstrate her professional expertise or to advance in her career.

For younger teachers, the opportunity to achieve Board certification is even more critical than for those of us known as "veterans." Far too many able teachers leave their classrooms and move into the private sector. I know faculty members who have left teaching for careers in real estate, computer science, corporate training, public relations, and finance. We are having a difficult time retaining our best teachers beyond the first seven years. Our schools can no longer afford a high attrition rate among young teachers full of promise. Board certification and the school-based changes it can provoke will make a difference to my younger colleagues.

The next group for whom the mission of the National Board creates a compelling argument are students planning careers. We will need to replace nearly 1.1 million teachers who are eligible for retirement within the next five years. Until now we have been

lucky. Women and minorities had few career choices, but times have changed and those who have in the past gone into teaching, have other opportunities today. The needs of our students, coupled with the demands of our changing world, challenge us to build a strong corps of effective teachers who appreciate the complexities of their responsibilities.

We can begin attracting those young people to a teaching career by promising them levels of professionalism that they now know are available only in other occupations. Too often I hear from students in my own classes and colleges I visit that they would like to consider a teaching career, but they fear that lack of professional responsibilities and the opportunity to exercise fully their skill and knowledge will be confining and ultimately frustrating. One university student with whom I met recently brought forth a sad but forceful tale. He told me that he spent much of his holiday convincing his parents that he wants to be a teacher. They countered with the argument that they did not send him to college to be "just a teacher." The time has come for the nation to recognize the honor, dignity and complexity of teaching and realize that no longer will anyone be "just a teacher."

Our work for the National Board will support, encourage and assist him and his peers to choose teaching with pride. We have a dramatic challenge to provide these students with assessment

methods and workplaces that beckon them to exercise their skills, capacities and knowledge in the most effective manner. The National Board invites me to say to my students, "Come, join me. I now can assure you we're on our way to creating a distinguished teaching profession."

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Committee. It has been a privilege to share my views with you.

Senator DODD. Thank you very, very much, Ms. Kaplan. Very eloquent testimony. We appreciate it very much, and congratulations on 27 years in the teaching profession.

Senator Thurmond, do you have any comments you would like to make before we ask questions of our panel?

Senator THURMOND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to leave in a few minutes.

I want to take this opportunity to welcome this fine panel. You have got two able governors here, one from my neighboring State who made a fine record there as governor, and the Governor of New Jersey who has made a splendid record there. Also we are so pleased to have Mr. Kelly here and Ms. Kaplan.

At first, I thought you were a co-ed. You say you are a teacher?

Ms. KAPLAN. Thank you, Senator. That was not a comment or question I expected. I thank you.

Senator THURMOND. There is no question that this Nation needs a high quality teaching profession. The United States faces new economic challenges. Jobs that once required only routine skills are fast disappearing, victims of automation and the shift of production to countries whose work forces are willing to work for wages that are a fraction of the United States wage rates.

Workers now have to be highly literate and able to adapt. It is estimated that the average worker will change jobs six times in his lifetime. If the United States is to maintain a healthy economy in this changing economic environment, it will have to depend on a better educated work force.

According to James A. Kelly, the first president of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, America is betting its future on its schools. It is more important now than at any other time in our country's history that the students graduating from our educational institutions can think critically and be productive. Teachers are the essential ingredient in developing an education system second to none.

Incidentally, I was a teacher and athletic coach for six years, and I have gotten no more satisfaction out of any other position than teaching and coaching, working with young people.

In 1986, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy published a report, "A Nation Prepared: Teachers For the 21st Century," to inaugurate new reforms for our public schools and new incentive systems to make certain schools perform effectively. The primary recommendation of the report was the establishment of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Accordingly, I commend you, Mr. Chairman, for moving ahead with this hearing and for addressing issues in this area. One issue of concern to me is what role, if any, the Federal Government should play in the financial support of this board. Professional standards are certainly to be commended. However, I am unaware of Federal funds being used to establish standards in other professions, and this could establish a precedent for funding other private organizations.

I am concerned, too, that this research might be more appropriately carried out within the U.S. Department of Education, unless there is some objection raised that I have not heard. However, I shall keep my mind open on this subject.

84-356 0 - 88 - 3

Mr. Chairman, I have to leave in just a minute. But while I am speaking, I would like to welcome one of our witnesses today who is from South Carolina, Dr. James A. Wilsford, who is on Panel II. Dr. Wilsford currently serves as the superintendent of Orangeburg School District No. 5 in Orangeburg, South Carolina. He has extensive experience in the field of education, having been a teacher since 1958. He has published several significant papers and speeches and has been nominated to numerous educational offices and appointments. Dr. Wilsford has also received many honors and awards by his peers. He is an involved and upstanding citizen in his community.

Dr. Wilsford, we are glad to have you here today, and I am confident the other members of the subcommittee will benefit from your valuable insights in this area.

Mr. Chairman, while my schedule will not allow me to stay for the entire hearing, I look forward to reviewing this testimony presented by the witnesses today. Again, I want to congratulate this able panel here today in the contribution you have made.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Senator Thurmond. I should point out I am fortunate to have as my ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism Senator Thurmond. He is a good ally and a good friend. We are delighted you are here this morning.

Let me get right to the heart of the matter. Both of our governors addressed the issue that is of concern to me. You just heard Senator Thurmond raise it as well. How will the Federal Government be involved in the funding of the Board? No one here is going to question or argue the degree of sophistication and the quality of the people you have brought together under this board. The need is clearly there, But, what happens next time? And what sort of standards should we maintain?

Governor Kean, you pointed out that the key words echoed by Governor Hunt are accountability and independence and trying to marry those two.

Let me mention six or seven points that I think deal with accountability. I would like to know if you think these encroach upon the independence issue. The first pertains to funding. If we were to fund the board in a 10–10–5 approach over three years it would not be $25 million all at once and you could simultaneously be soliciting the support from local, State, as well as private sector. I do not need to tell any of you the problem we face with the deficit. While this does not sound like much every nickel is going to be scrutinized carefully. Then consider the $1 Federal match and so forth.

Second, If we were to fence in the Federal funds for strictly R&D, we would not be getting into the administrative costs of the board. This is the point that addresses the concern of Senator Thurmond. We would be focusing on research and could avoid criticism.

The Federal R&D fund is only for research in Federal priority areas. So we should try and outline in legislation R&D areas where the Federal funds may be spent, assessments and testing for minority, handicap, bilingual math, science, foreign language teachers and the like. I certainly do not want to limit it to that, but by trying to keep it in areas where there clearly is a Federal priority

we would avoid the encroachment on State and local priorities in the educational field.

Third, auditing and accounting, and bookkeeping would be a must.

Fourth, you would have to meet the requirement to conduct competitions for R&D contracts.

Fifth, Senator Thurmond raised the issue why not the Department of Education? I think it is important. The Department of Education fills an important function here and if the board is going to receive Federal funds the Department of Education should serve in some advisory capacity.

Finally, contract guarantee, selection procedures and preemptive restrictions on board's activities are some of the most delicate areas of concern. Historically we have delegated to the State and localities the primary responsibility in the educational fields. So we want to make it clear that we are not encroaching on that.

Now, I have mentioned six or seven points. If you would care to comment or if you find any of them onerous, It would be helpful to know. I think it is the major hurdle we face.

Governor HUNT. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond just briefly, and I think some others, including our president, Jim Kelly, may want to also.

First of all, I would just urge you to realize that this is different. This is not the doctors or the lawyers or the accountants or the architects. This is America's education, mostly in the public schools. Therefore, there is a public responsibility. There is a public concern about doing this job well, about having these professionals really good.

You know, the sort of private professions kind of take care of themselves in a way. They have done it over a longer period of time. And, frankly, I think I would want to say they are not perhaps as crucial to our economic future as education is today. So I think we need to realize that this is different, and there is a major public responsibility here. That is why we need to have some involvement.

I think, as a matter of fact, we might find that some R&D funds have gone from the National Science Foundation or other places for some of the medical things. But that is something to be looked into. I simply would want to urge you to realize that this is new and different, and we need to be creative enough to figure out a way to do this.

The final thing I would want to say is that we have got to do this job in America. Yes, the State and local governments have the primary funding responsibility. Yes, they decide on curriculum. Yes, they hire teachers; they should. But there needs to be a creative role for our national Government to help give it leadership, to very definitely make some things happen that will encourage us at the State and local levels to do the things we ought to do. That is the kind of thing we are talking about here.

Senator DODD. Thank you. Governor Kean.

Governor KEAN. Just very briefly. I have no problem—and Jim will comment further, I know—I have no problem with any of the points that you raise here. I think they are all controls that I

would expect from the Congress. To my mind, they would be welcome and necessary.

It is so different. If we are going to really do the kind of things that we are saying we are going to do, all of us in public life—the presidential candidates in both parties, everybody who is talking now about really standing American education on its head, and the necessity for doing so. The heart of the matter, we all know, is the teacher.

I had something called Talks With Teachers in New Jersey that we have also been doing in the Education Commission of the States around the country. We sit ordinary teachers down and have a discussion. I expected pay to be one of the problems they raised right away. It was not. Money occasionally came up, but it was not the primary thing they raised.

The issue they raised was what Susan Kaplan talked about. It was recognition. It was making people feel the importance of what they do. It was feeling part of a profession that was respected. Unless we do that, I think everything that we are trying to do in the States and in the Congress will not be as effective as we mean it to be.

I think the Federal Government does have a role in this; of course, the States could probably do it without the Federal Government. It would take us longer. It would probably take us ten years. We would probably have to make some compromises along the way. I do not think as a Nation we can wait that long. So I think it is vital that we have a Federal partnership in this, and that the controls you are talking about be part of that partnership.

Senator DODD. I agree with you totally. As I mentioned to Governor Hunt yesterday, this is a matter, I think, of such urgency, given the limited amount of time we have in this session. I do not need to go through the problems we face with all the items before us: an INF agreement, campaign finance reform; a budget process and appropriations bills. And if we get into a protracted contest over things, it will be more difficult to address the NBPTS' issues.

I was trying to fashion a thing here that would not encroach upon your independence, and yet satisfy the legitimate concerns of my colleagues who want to make sure there is accountability. If we meet those standards and goals of accountability here without violating your independence as a board, I think we can deal with this legislation pretty expeditiously.

If not, my concern is that we will get into a fight. Once the mindset locks on to something, it is much more difficult to have a person reach two decisions—one to change their mind and then support something—than it is to have the support at the outset. So the accountability question is an important one, and I could not agree with you more, Governor Kean, about the priorities of teachers. We have got to be careful about generalizing because there are differences of opinion. But teachers are not fools. They know very well that if money was the issue, they clearly would choose another profession, particularly in today's environment.

It is the recognition. And the other comments I hear from my sister and her colleagues and friends are working conditions, workplace conditions, and their inability and their own sense of frustration about having an impact on the working conditions in their in-

stitutions. We are lucky to have Commissioner Tirozzi in Connecticut. He is responsible for Connecticut-California experience. Two States, 3,000 miles apart in a joint venture in this area. That is exciting, and it is going to be interesting to watch how that works.

Mr. Kaplan, do you have a comment?

Mr. KELLY. I am honored to be called Mr. Kaplan.

Senator DODD. After Senator Thurmond's comments, I think anyone would be honored. [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLY. But the real Mr. Kaplan might object.

I would just like to make a brief comment on the issue of accountability, Senator. We have thought through the issue of accountability and are in favor of it, and we have come forward with a rather long laundry list of specifics clustered in three general areas.

One is accountability for the expenditure of funds. We intend to be as scrupulous and clean and audited as you would want and as our many other constituencies and donors would want.

Second, with regard to the quality of research, we intend to establish a system for allocating and assigning our funds in the research field that honors our motive, which is simply to find the finest people in the country to work. We have no motive other than to find the best, and we intend to adopt the kinds of merit review procedures that have been used widely in the private and public sectors.

Third, we pledge the public distribution of the results of our research to the Congress and to other organizations.

Of the list of items that are in Governor Hunt's prepared testimony, there are some 12 different proposals that we have advanced to reflect our interest in responding to your concern about accountability. With regard to the list that you have presented, the only item on it which I think we should flag for attention is the item about the Department of Education in an advisory capacity. We are happy to look at any specific proposal that would meet the tests that Governor Kean summarized as independence and accountability. If, in an advisory capacity, the Department began to review the selection of particular contractors who would be working on the development of standards and the development of assessment items, in my opinion that would raise a question about Federal intrusion into the establishment of standards.

So we are intending to come forward with a full range of accountability proposals, dealing with communications, review, comment, public access and accountability for funds and so forth. But I do think that we need to be sensitive to where we draw the line so that it does not, in fact or in appearance, raise that question of federal control of the Board's standards and assessments.

Senator DODD. I appreciate that, and we will have some people here later who can address that particular point as well.

My last question is for you, Ms. Kaplan. I almost called you Ms. Kelly. Obviously, the question that comes to mind for those of us sitting up her is how you think teachers generally will respond to the whole notion of standards. There has been, as you know, a lot of criticism. I know Governor Clinton in Arkansas, for instance, went through a very difficult time with his relationship with the teachers associations in his State. That was a different issue than

this, and I do not want to leave any doubts about confusing issues here of standards and licensing, as both the governors have pointed out.

What do you believe will be the reaction of teachers generally to this idea of setting up standards such as this?

Ms. KAPLAN. I am delighted you asked me that question, because I have been going around for the past year-and-a-half talking to teachers throughout the country about this work, and I also spent some time looking at some of the prototypes of assessments. And I have studied some of the research that is being developed now. I am so encouraged by the fact that they are not minimum standards tests. There will be no minimum multiple choice test.

This will be an attestation of what it is a teacher can do and, in fact, does in the classroom: preparing a lesson, selecting textbooks, perhaps demonstrating a lesson, perhaps bringing a videotape to an assessment center. These are all possibilities, and teachers are excited about that. They do not want to teach without portfolio any longer. They want to demonstrate what it is that they know they can do, their knowledge of learners, and their knowledge of educational aims for their community.

So, the idea that this is a sophisticated assessment which really, in fact, allows teachers to demonstrate their skills, their capacities, and their knowledge, is, I believe is a powerful argument in its behalf.

Second, the teachers are really poignant in their urgency. They are ready for this to begin. They are also eager for the research that will stem naturally from the development of the assessments.

Another point to remember is that sitting for board certification is voluntary. It means: I will choose. Twenty-seven years, and I want to be board certified. For me it represents an opportunity and a promise, and one that I can learn from and, in fact, improve my teaching. If I go through an experience in which I see I have to make some really hard decisions about which textbook I should use for which particular class, and account for that, I want to do that. And if I do not do it successfully, I want to learn how I can be more successful.

So I think teachers embrace the concept of demonstrating their skills, their knowledge, and the teachers with whom I have spoken are in favor of the board, in favor of sophisticated assessments. Certainly, there are skeptics. Certainly, there are skeptics among my veteran peers. We have seen it all. We have seen everything come down the pike in education. As I said, some of the things we have embraced. But this is an opportunity that we cannot let slip by. It is too critical.

As I look at the changing population of my own school and the schools in my district, we have to do things differently. And we have to prepare our young people to join us in teaching careers. I think that the research and development activities of the National Board allow us that opportunity.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much.

Senator Stafford?

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have sat here and found that most of the questions I had intended to ask have already been asked, either in your direct state-

ments or in response to Chairman Dodd's questions. I still do have one or two. Having once been a governor myself so long ago that even my constituents have forgotten it, and with two governors here, it occurs to me that my experience then and in the years down here indicates that when we do a so-called one-shot provision of funds, we find that one shot never stops. And the program continues.

So I would remind you, all of you from the board, that the time will come probably when the record from this committee and maybe the record on the Senate and House floors will indicate you said it was your intention that this simply be a one-shot effort as far as the Federal Government is concerned.

I see all of you but Mr. Kelly nodding affirmatively as I say that. That is your intention, is it not?

Governor Hunt. Absolutely, Senator.

Mr. KELLY. Yes, sir. In the other professions that certify their members, all of which have smaller population bases than we do by a considerable factor, the record indicates that a certification system can be self-sustaining when it is operating. Our need for funds at this point is strictly for research and development activities to get started.

Senator STAFFORD. Sure. Then I have one other, maybe, and that has to do with the certification of teachers. If it occurs, as you project it may—and I think that is a good idea—but the licensing of the teacher remains a prerogative of the State, is there not a chance that some states even under pressure will not wish to impose standards as high as board certification teachers on the licensing of teachers in their States? Do you see any problem there?

Governor KEAN. I think that the teachers themselves are going to be the ones who want the standards and the recognition. Some States are going to have standards that are not very high. Some States today have standards that are not very high. It is too bad some of them are not going to improve.

But once teachers themselves can become nationally board-certified teachers, they are going to be recognized; they are going to be in demand within the States; they are going to be able to look at some of the schools and find out how many board-certified teachers are in those schools. That will be one way of measuring quality. To me, the National Board is even more important for those States that may not have as high standards as you and I would like for the certification of teachers.

Governor HUNT. Senator, that is a good question. I frankly believe that, of course, licensing must be a State function. That is why we have got to be so careful about the Federal Government role here. But I would be delighted if States like Connecticut and California, and I hope North Carolina and others, would see high standards in a board certification process and say: Let us start raising those standards for licensing up gradually, and move them up. I would love to see that happen. But that has got to be a State decision, individual State decision, just as which teachers are going to be chosen in a local school district—my wife is on the school board. They have got to make those decisions.

If they decide that they are going to try their best to hire board-certified teachers, power to them. But that has got to be their decision.

Senator STAFFORD. All right. That brings me to the last question that I have in mind. That is, how can we assure that board-certified teachers do not migrate to the most attractive schools and avoid a fair distribution of such teachers throughout our school systems in the country?

Governor KEAN. Well, right now we have a great deal of trouble in the States evaluating the schools. We have measures of evaluation. Those schools that are in trouble one way or another, we try to give them more funds and more help. No question that some of these teachers are going to migrate to the best schools, just as they are now. But we have no way of measuring now who gets the good teachers and who does not.

If we can look at a school in my State and say, yes, we have got board-certified teachers, but there are not any in that school, we can go and look at that school a little more carefully and say: Why not? Maybe we can develop the incentives so that we can get some great teachers into that school, some board-certified teachers. I think it gives us an additional tool; an additional tool of measurement, an additional tool of trying to find measures within the States to attract these kinds of teachers to the schools that need them the most.

Governor HUNT. Senator Stafford, if I may just comment on that. I know what would happen in the legislature of North Carolina. The Speaker of our House is from way up in the mountains, from a very rural area; and if he looks around North Carolina in eight years and sees that Charlotte and Greensboro and the Research Triangle have the great bulk of these board-certified teachers, he is going to demand that we do something to get more of those best teachers out around our State.

Now, I do not know exactly what it is going to be. It is going to be various kinds of incentives, whatever. I do know that now those best teachers in large part are going to those central areas. We have got the problem now. This at least will give us honest information about the nature of it, and we will figure out through our democratic political process a way to deal with it, I believe.

Senator STAFFORD. I thank you all very much. Either Mr. Kelly or Ms. Kaplan, did you want to comment on that last question?

Mr. KELLY. I would just say, Senator, that education financing inequities in the country are there. I have worked in that field all my life. The Board did not invent the problem. The Board is sensitive to the problem, and we would hope to be a constructive player on the scene to make sure that all school districts and all kinds of children have equitable access to Board-certified teachers. That is a major concern of many of the members of our Board, and we will be concerned about it.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you.

Ms. KAPLAN. And if I may say, we do know there is some maldistribution of teachers now, and we do know that the best teachers should be in the most challenging and difficult workplaces. But it is not just money, and we all hear of corporate raiding. Sometimes, teacher-raiding has the potential for being positive. It will force

teachers and school districts to look at what they are doing and perhaps divide the pie a little differently, but to provide workplaces where the teachers can make those decisions, and more than just on salaries.

Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. I thank you all very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DODD. Thank you. Let me just mention lastly with regard to Mr. Kelly about the Department of Education involvement. I know there is a great deal of sensitivity about that particular concern. I was not talking about a veto by the Department of Education at all.

A couple of points: One, there is a lot of expertise that exists there in the merit review procedures, and they do get involved in that. Obviously, the Federal priorities in research areas is obviously one to watch and to be involved in. But I would not suggest there be a veto. I think there is also a tendency on the part of the education community—speaking now very broadly and very much at large—to assume that the people who are presently in place are going to be in place forever. Things do change.

There was a real struggle to establish a Department of Education, and there was an effort, frankly, to get rid of it a few years ago. While people may disagree with the current inhabitants the fact of the matter is having the Department of Education, elevating the status of education at a Cabinet level is extremely important, and I do not think it ought to be something that people see in any adversarial capacity or role. I do not think you did, but I did not mean to imply a veto necessarily.

It was a pleasure to have two distinguished governors, a former one and a present one, with us. And, Mr. Kelly, Ms. Kaplan from New England, we are delighted to have you with us this morning.

Ms. KAPLAN. Thank you.

Senator DODD. We thank you for being here. We look forward to working with you on these concerns. Hopefully, we can move something rather rapidly for you. I make no promises, but we thank you.

Our next panel will include Dr. Chester Finn, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement in the Department of Education; Mr. Alan Campbell, vice chairman of the board and executive vice president of ARA Services, chairman of the Committee for Economic Development's Task Force on the Teaching Profession; Mr. Gordon Ambach, executive director, Council of Chief State School Officers; and Dr. Wilsford, who has been referred to earlier by Senator Thurmond, superintendent from Orangeburg School District No. 5, Orangeburg, South Carolina, with the American Association of School Administrators.

We welcome all of you here. You have been patient to wait through the testimony of our governors. I would ask you, to try and keep your remarks down to about seven to ten minutes max so we can get to Panel III and also get to questions.

We will begin in the order that I have introduced you. Dr. Finn, we welcome you. I am glad you are here. Having just heard the last exchange, we would be interested in your comments, both the concern raised by Mr. Kelly and my response to it, and we are in-

terested in hearing the Department of Education's comments on this proposal.

STATEMENTS OF DR. CHESTER E. FINN, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, DC; ALAN K. CAMPBELL, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, ARA SERVICES, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT'S TASK FORCE ON THE TEACHING PROFESSION, PHILADELPHIA, PA; GORDON M. AMBACH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS, WASHINGTON, DC; AND DR. JAMES A. WILSFORD, SUPERINTENDENT, ORANGEBURG SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 5, ORANGEBURG, SC, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, ARLINGTON, VA

Dr. FINN. Senator, we appreciate the invitation. The Department of Education has already been part of the discussion this morning, as you suggest. We are pleased to be.

It would doubtless be even more pleasant to join a flock of bluebirds of happiness who are flying here today with regard to the proposal before the Senate.

Senator DODD. I would be disappointed if you did.

Dr. FINN. But I would like to add a couple more touches of realism to some thoughts that have already been voiced.

Let me first say we do very much share the goals of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. We admire its members. We have high hopes for its success. Indeed we wish it would move a bit faster toward that success.

We agree that it is important to vouchsafe the independence and the integrity of the board. We do not want it to be a Federal board. We do not think that certifying teachers or setting standards for teachers ought to become a Federal responsibility now or later, regardless of whether there is a Department of Education and regardless of who may occupy it in the future.

We have had a friendly, arm's length relationship with the National Board up to this point. We would be pleased to continue such a relationship. But now the board is taking the initiative to change the terms of the relationship. The board is seeking Federal funds, and it is seeking what by our lights is a very substantial amount of Federal funds.

The 25 million Federal dollars that are being requested exceeds the total fiscal year 89 budget request for our Office of Research. Let me say it again. The amount that the board is requesting for its five-year duration exceeds our total education research budget in the Office of Research within the Department of Education.

The $5 million annual rate at which the board is seeking Federal funds is approximately five times as much as any of our major national research centers at universities presently receive for doing research into significant education issues. So we are talking about a good deal of money.

We generally look at Federal education research funds—and I might say the Appropriations Committees look at these even more closely—in terms of hundreds of thousands of dollars. The $25 and

$50 million sums being discussed today in this context are enormous sums of money. They may not sound like such in other contexts that the subcommittee is accustomed to dealing with, but in education research these are huge sums.

We do not oppose the idea that some Federal support might be forthcoming for some of the activities of the board. We are not hostile. We are open-minded. But there is a wishy aspect to the proposition that the board will have its cake and eat it, too; that it will obtain Federal dollars while maintaining its current arm's length relationship and independence.

The provision of Federal funds will inherently and automatically and inevitably change the relationship, no matter what people wish, no matter what people say, no matter what people think. At least with regard to the uses of any Federal funds that the National Board ends up getting, the board cannot reasonably expect to be free from the kinds of accountability arrangements that always accompany Federal research funds.

Let me be clear that we already support research into various aspects of teaching, and we expect to continue doing so. The board would already be welcome under the current arrangements to seek to participate in those activities and to seek the kinds of funds that are already being expended—smaller sums, generally—for research into these areas. And as we make and remake and revise our research agenda, we are certainly prepared to consider accommodating some of the board's top priority research questions.

But the customary arrangements for Federal education research include at least four stages of accountability. And they have not all been discussed here today. A couple of them have been more or less spurned by spokesmen for the board.

The first stage is submission of a well-formulated research plan. But, we have not seen one from the National Board. I do not believe they have one yet. Mind you, it is not wholly unreasonable that they would not have one yet. Fifty million dollars is a nice round sum, and three to five years is a nice round period of time. But we would ordinarily expect to see a detailed research agenda indicating at the very least, what kinds of questions are going to be examined, how long it is going to take, and how much they are going to cost. That is what I call a research plan.

Second, we ordinarily expect expert peer review of those research plans to be carried out before any funds are awarded. Peer reviewers are customarily selected by the Department of Education. Any other Federal research agency does the same thing with regard to its research funds. It selects expert reviewers to go over the research plans before any funds are awarded. And, incidentally, the reviewers also look at plans submitted by competitors for those funds, by other entities that propose to take the same money and do either the same or different things with them. This review is intended to judge which ones might do it best or most economically. So that is the second stage; peer review.

The third stage is, of course, periodic progress reports and submission of various work products. Those, too, are subjected to expert review by outside scholars and researchers and practitioners, again selected by the Department of Education. So the review of product is the third category.

The fourth, which has already been alluded to today, is accounting for the expenditure of funds to make sure that any monies were spent as intended, for the purposes agreed to in advance.

Now, those four stages define the customary relationship between a Federal research agency and its grantees and contractors. There are variations in them, but those are the essential elements.

Those elements are in place today for 19 national research centers that we currently fund at 16 universities; a couple of universities have two of them. Even with all of these arrangements in place, we do not in any way control or censor the intellectual output of the researchers. They are absolutely free to conduct their research as they see fit and come to the conclusions that they want to, to publish them and disseminate them in any ways they like. We do not have to agree with their findings. Everybody would be appalled at the suggestion that there is any intellectual censorship of the fruits of the research. Even when we may well not think it is very sensible, it is absolutely the prerogative of the researchers to bring their findings forth and do with them as they like.

Lots of the Nation's most distinguished education researchers have seen fit to accommodate themselves to these arrangements. Indeed, many of the same researchers who, I predict, the National Board will end up wanting to use to carry out its research agenda, already accommodate themselves to these accountability arrangements with the Department of Education. They do not seem to find the arrangements unacceptable or intolerable, and they do not claim censorship of the fruits of their labors.

Let me just conclude by saying that I do not really know how much research is truly essential before the board gets about its work. An awful lot of us wish they would hurry up and get about their main work. There is an awful lot known today about what constitutes good teaching. It is not hard today to find out whether children are learning. It is not hard in many personnel systems conducted by teachers and administrators to know whether a teacher is good. This is obviously an avenue open to learning more, and research will be useful; but I do not think this nice round sum of $50 million is necessarily the amount of research that needs to be done before the board actually gets to work, or that three to five years must necessarily elapse before the board gets to work. If all of the things that need to be done to improve the state of the teaching profession are going to get done, they ought to start expeditiously. I am not sure that the truly necessary research agenda, frankly, is as large as has been suggested here. But since we have not seen it, it is very hard to evaluate with any specificity.

Let me say once again we do not want to control the National Board. We do want the National Board to be a success. We do wish it well. We are prepared to try to cooperate with it, but we also suggest that, if it is to receive Federal funds, it has to follow the customary routines that other research enterprises are accustomed to following.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Finn follows:]

Statement by Chester E. Finn, Jr.

Assistant Secretary and Counselor to the Secretary

U.S. Department of Education

Prepared for delivery to the Subcommittee on Education

Committee on Labor and Human Resources

United States Senate

February 18, 1988

I appreciate this opportunity to appear on behalf of the U.S. Department of Education to discuss the Administration's views not on a specific legislative proposal but, rather, on a general proposition: that the federal government ought to subsidize the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Ever since issuance of the 1986 report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, A Nation Prepared, we at the Education Department have hoped that the national board recommended therein will turn out to be a significant force for the improvement of teacher standards and quality. Certainly it has that potential. If it sets high standards, based on actual knowledge and effectiveness, rather than paper credentials and length-of-service; if it is unabashed in recognizing that some teachers are better at what they do than others, and that the best deserve greater status, responsibility and compensation; if it expedites entry into the classroom of able and well-educated individuals who would like to teach but did not undergo a conventional teacher education program; if it facilitates the mobility of a first-rate teacher across district and state lines; if it renders easier the task of administrators and school boards seeking to determine which among several candidates for a teaching post is strongest; if it enhances teacher

professionalism--if it does all these things, it will be a national treasure. 2

But as yet it has done none of these things. It is only a plan, an intention, a group of people who have not made many of their most difficult decisions. And as yet it has the potential for becoming much ado about nothing. Indeed, it even harbors a potential for harm, for raised expectations followed by dashed hopes, for large expenses associated with no palpable boost in quality, for succumbing to some familiar but pernicious ideas, of which by far the worst is the doctrine that there can be no meaningful differentiation among teachers, especially experienced teachers, on the basis of their actual knowledge and effectiveness.

It is because so much about the Board remains undecided and unknown that we at the Education Department have taken a "wait and see" attitude, full of hope and goodwill but unwilling to render judgment while so many key actions and decisions lie in the future.

We believe that is the proper attitude at this time and we would like to maintain it. But now the Board is seeking federal funds. And in so doing it is, in effect, asking us to change our relationship to it. From an arms-length, amiable, hopeful but distant relationship with a non-governmental entity, we are now asked to consider providing substantial financial support for this as-yet-unproven enterprise.

We do not find that proposition unthinkable or abhorrent.[3] We do insist, however, that it would change the nature of the relationship. For we have solemn obligations to voters and taxpayers to see that the funds we disburse are well-spent; that value is received for the federal dollar; that goals are achieved; that products are delivered; that there is a return on investment; and that there is proper accountability on the part of recipients.

The National Board cherishes its independence from government (and from myriad interest groups within the field of education), and we concur that this is one of its greatest assets. There is a world of difference between a "national" board in this field that operates under private, voluntary sponsorship, and a "federal" board. The latter would be a terrible mistake.

But we insist that <u>any and all</u> federal funds in the field of education need to be accompanied by suitable accountability mechanisms. If I may quote a remark that Senator Pell made in 1974,

> [T]he more Federal assistance you get, of course, the more Federal control of your institutions there is, because there is a great deal of truth in the old adage 'He who pays the piper calls the tune.'

This "truth" may not be optimal or welcome, but it is realistic. Just as we expect local educators to be accountable to the voters and taxpayers (and parents) of their

communities, so too must government grantees and contractors be accountable, through the pertinent executive branch agency, to the American public. Otherwise scarce tax dollars may be wasted or misspent. This is true of all the Education Department's "big" programs; it is also true of our small discretionary and research programs. We believe it must be true of any federal funds that may in time subsidize the work of the National Board.

In truth, we regret that the issue has arisen. The National Board would be better off without federal funds. We hate to see it following the too-familiar pattern: a promising private initiative that begins without any hint of public funding soon turning down the well-trod path toward Uncle Sam and his checkbook. It is said, of course, that federal funds are wanted only for the "research and development" aspects of this undertaking and that federal support would therefore come to an end in a few years' time. Would that it were so. Perhaps it will be. But I must remind the Subcommittee that such predictions seldom come true, that such promises are rarely kept. Instead, in the usual case, a dependency relationship is initiated that never really ends.

I do not quarrel with the National Board's commitment to research and development. It has undertaken a most ambitious task and it naturally wants to be sure that it is proceeding with as much objectivity, consistency, accuracy and scientific

rigor as possible. Choosing among teachers on the basis of their effectiveness (assuming that the Board does not flinch from this, its central undertaking) is no simple project, especially when the field of vision spans the whole nation, all subjects and specialties, and every level of elementary-secondary education.

No doubt some research is warranted. No doubt it will take funds. No doubt the Department of Education sponsors education research--and some of the research that we have sponsored in the past (e.g. the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State University) and are sponsoring in the present (e.g. the Center for Research on Teacher Education, also at Michigan State, and the Center for the Study of Teacners and Teaching in the Secondary School Context, at Stanford University) is certainly pertinent to issues that the National Board wants to examine.

We would be pleased to work with the National Board -- and, of course, with the Congress -- in reviewing the Education Department's own research agenda in this domain. (I note, however, that during a recent period for public comment on the research priorities of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement for the next two years, we heard nothing from the National Board.) We would naturally consider the National Board itself -- or institutions affiliated with it -- as potential applicants for various research projects

or research centers that we may sponsor in the future.[6] Due to the singular mission of the National Board and the high hopes that we hold for it, we are willing also to make special efforts to accommodate high priority elements of its research agenda, provided that it is able to present a well-conceived, rational and feasible plan that proceeds in an orderly fashion, that emphasizes important (rather than merely "interesting") issues, and that has value beyond the immediate needs of the National Board. We would expect any such activities to be subjected to customary quality control and review procedures (including external peer review) and to the fiscal accounting procedures that are routinely associated with receipt of federal research funds.

We do not think it is reasonable for the National Board to expect to be given a vat of "no-strings" money from the federal government; nor do we think that it should consider itself a "wholesale" distributor of unsupervised federal research funds to "retailers" of its own choosing. Perhaps private donors will be amenable to supporting such arrangements. We do not believe that the federal taxpayer should be expected to.

I do not deny that such things happen. The current "continuing resolution" contains dozens of projects that Congress has directed the executive branch to fund without the customary reviews, without competition, and with little or no

accountability. These are commonly known as "pork barrel" projects. They are repugnant to us and to all proper researchers. We would hate to see the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, an entity that can only succeed if it embodies high standards, integrity and accountability, begin by behaving as if it were just another hungry diner at the federal table. 7

Two final comments. First,the Subcommittee should be aware that the Fiscal 1988 appropriation for the Education Department contains virtually no discretionary funds that can be made available for this purpose, and that the FY 1989 budget that is being sent to Congress today was prepared long before this issue arose, hence is inattentive to it.

Second, the Subcommittee ought to be wary of the researcher's mantra, "More research is needed." Sometimes it is; sometimes it is merely a service to the researchers -- and to those with other reasons for delaying tactics. Evaluating teacher effectiveness, as I have said, is not a simple proposition, but neither is it like searching for new sub-atomic particles or cures for AIDS. It is not difficult to determine whether a teacher's students are learning what they should; and it is not particularly difficult for veteran teachers and skilled administrators to tell from visual inspection whether a teacher is doing a good job in the classroom. Such "peer review" is the essence of thousands of

teacher evaluations that occur every week in the United States, is an element in tens of thousands of personnel decisions, and is the core of teacher "career ladder" programs already underway in many states and localities. And <u>some</u> things that one wants to know about a teacher -- notably his or her mastery of the content of the subject(s) to be taught -- <u>can</u> be appraised through well-crafted written tests. Thus much of the "technology" that the National Board requires to do its job is already available. It can undoubtedly be refined and extended, and we have no quarrel with the Board's desire to do so. The more we learn about good teaching, the better. But it is not all that mysterious today. And we shouldn't have to wait very much longer for the Board to begin actually doing the job that we all wish it well in doing. It just may be that the capacity to make tough decisions is more urgently needed than is a huge amount of new research.

Senator DODD. Thank you.

Mr. Campbell?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, Senator Stafford, I will attempt to respond to some of the issues which have been raised over the past few minutes about the need for Federal funds and the issue of accountability. I have written testimony, which I know will be placed in the record, which makes many of the points that have already been made about the significance of the education issue in this country and the relevance of certification to responding to that issue.

May I just say in passing that, as a senior executive in a major corporation which employs 110,000 people across this country, we are very aware of the need for improving the quality of young people who come to us at entry levels, whether it be in nursing homes, child care centers, or food service operations. We also are very aware of the international competition because of our activities in Europe and Japan.

Second, I would like to make the point of the urgency of what we are about. I must say that I am a bit taken aback by Dr. Finn's suggestion that we have not been moving fast enough. I served on the original Carnegie Task Force, and on the planning board that created the National Board. We have done all of that in three years. In the process, we have created a consensus in the education community of the need for teacher professionalization. It is our feeling that we have moved very rapidly and are now on the verge of a major breakthrough if we are successful in obtaining the resources needed.

There has been some work done on the kind of research and development which is required. And although there is, indeed, a good deal known out there about what constitutes good teaching, I personally serve on the board of one of the centers financed by the Education Department, the one which is associated with Rutgers, University of Wisconsin, Madison, and Stanford, which is working on education policy issues, and I am aware of the quality of work that center is doing. But I would urge on you how much needs to be accomplished.

Perhaps that is illustrated by the assumption that $50 million to be spent over several years is considered an unusually large amount. Compared to the size of the educational enterprise, it would be considered by every other field to be minuscule. The small amount is a measure of the neglect of R&D for education and an argument in favor of today's request for support of the National Board.

Why Government financing? Related to other professions—medicine, architecture, engineering, professions which are private sector activities, by and large, which are dominated by partnerships and professional firms and corporations that have substantial resources, and are characterized by pay systems which compensate the successful members of those professions very well indeed. This is quite in contrast to education. The employer side in education is the public sector and pay levels for teachers do not approach those of most other professions.

Public sector support, therefore, for professional certification of teachers is justified by its employer role just as employers help sup-

port certification in other fields. Such assistance therefore possesses a legitimacy which goes beyond that of normal government subsidy.

Just as we are seeking Federal support; we shall also seek State support. I will be very surprised if we do not get some State support to help us match the Federal support.

There will also be, I believe corporate support. Let me add that I am deeply involved in the interaction between the business community and education, serving on the CED subcommittee which produced their two reports on education. I also am moderating a meeting to be held later this month under the auspices of the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation of a dozen business CEOs to ask the question: What should be the business community's next step in support of education reform?

There is, as you probably are aware, some controversy about the role of business thus far in education reform. Some have agreed that programs like Adopt-A-School have been reinforcing of the status quo, as opposed to bringing about the kind of revolutionary changes that many people, including me, are necessary. As Ted Kolderie said in his recent article in the Harvard Business Review, "What business has been doing thus far is a little bit like a father doing his daughter's homework. It is a kindness, but it does not serve her interest."

Now, there are a lot of other things business is doing. All I am suggesting is that there is that kind of ferment. And by the way, in the most recent poll by the National Conference Board of Business Leaders about major issues in this country, 64 percent responded that education was, making it the highest by over 20 percent, and the first time that education has ever been first on that list.

In relation to accountability for the use of the funds we are requesting I would simply suggest that the kind of accountability clearly acceptable is that represented by an appropriate audit. On the other hand, it is essential that supstantive independence be granted. This national certification must not become a governmental program. It must remain voluntary and it must be controlled by the profession, by the teaching profession.

It is important that there be a line drawn between that profession and the Government. If it were not necessary to move as quickly as we think the National Board must, we could perhaps raise the necessary resource without federal help; that is what we would prefer to do. But we really believe because of the urgency and the need for the blessing that would come with Government support, for what it would do for us with State Governments and with the private sector, that we at least have an obligation to try to obtain that kind of support.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Campbell follows:]

TESTIMONY

SENATE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

FEBRUARY 18, 1988

BY ALAN K. CAMPBELL

MR. CHAIRMAN. . .

MY NAME IS ALAN K. CAMPBELL. I AM CURRENTLY VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF ARA SERVICES, INC., A DIVERSIFIED SERVICE CORPORATION EMPLOYING APPROXIMATELY 110,000 WORKERS. I HAVE BEEN INVOLVED OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS IN A VARIETY OF INITIATIVES CONCERNED WITH THE DELIVERY OF EDUCATION SERVICES, PARTICULARLY AT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVELS. THESE INCLUDE THE TWO CED POLICY SUBCOMMITTEES CHAIRED BY BRAD BUTLER, THE FIRST OF WHICH PROPOSED MAJOR CHANGES IN THE PROVISION OF EDUCATION SERVICES, WHILE THE SECOND FOCUSED ON THE UNIQUE PROBLEMS OF AT-RISK YOUTH. I WAS ALSO A MEMBER OF THE CARNEGIE TASK FORCE ON TEACHING AS A PROFESSION WHICH ADVOCATED SOME FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES IN THE STRUCTURE OF DELIVERING EDUCATION SERVICES, AND NOW SIT ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS, THE CREATION OF WHICH WAS ONE OF THE CENTRAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF OUR TASK FORCE. I ALSO SERVE AS CHAIR OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD.

An Emerging Consensus

These are but a few of the many reports that have been issued over the past half-dozen years, examining and making recommendations to solve what are believed to be very fundamental problems with the American education system. There appears to be a consensus emerging from these studies about what must be done. The more recent reports move a considerable distance from the first major report, A Nation at Risk, which strongly emphasized mandating changes in the regulation and direction of education from state governments and central school district offices. That report recommended the imposition of stricter curriculum standards, increasing the length of the school year, more homework requirements and testing the competence of both teachers and students.

Recommendations emerging from many of the reports made since then have taken a quite different route toward improving the education provided by our schools. Perhaps the greatest amount of agreement has been found in the insistence that there is a need for education to stress the teaching of what are called "higher order skills". The emphasis, in other words, in not on a return-to-basics but, rather, on the proposition that if students are to compete successfully in the job market and, if American industry and services are to be competitive in the international marketplace, it is essential that education provide a set of skills that go far beyond what is normally

MEANT BY THE WORD "BASIC". IN BRIEF, THOSE HIGHER ORDER SKILLS INCLUDE: THE ABILITY TO DRAW CONCLUSIONS FROM WRITTEN INFORMATION; TO COMMUNICATE AN IDEA OR POINT OF VIEW EFFECTIVELY IN A COHERENT ESSAY; AND THE ABILITY TO SOLVE PROBLEMS INVOLVING MATHEMATICAL REASONING BY USING NUMERICAL FACTS.

The Professionalization of Teaching

TO PROVIDE AN EDUCATION WHICH WILL GIVE STUDENTS THAT ANALYTICAL ABILITY WILL REQUIRE, IN THE JUDGEMENT OF THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN EXAMINING THESE ISSUES - - AND THEY ARE A VARIED LOT OF SCHOLARS, BUSINESS PEOPLE, UNION LEADERS AND ELECTED OFFICIALS - - THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF TWO MAJOR GOALS. THE FIRST IS THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF TEACHING AND THE OTHER IS THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE EDUCATION DELIVERY SYSTEM. THESE TWO GOALS REINFORCE ONE ANOTHER. WE WILL NOT GET A GOOD RETURN ON OUR INVESTMENT IN SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING UNLESS WE ARE ABLE TO CREATE A GENUINE PROFESSION OF TEACHING. AND, WE WILL BE UNABLE TO CREATE SUCH A PROFESSION UNLESS WE CHANGE THE MANNER IN WHICH WE STAFF OUR SCHOOLS AND ORGANIZE INSTRUCTION.

HIGHER PAY AND BETTER TEACHER PREPARATION ARE ALSO IMPORTANT, BUT THE OPPORTUNITY IN THE SCHOOLS FOR TEACHERS TO FUNCTION LIKE PROFESSIONALS IS ESSENTIAL. THE "TEACHER PROOF" SYSTEMS THAT HAVE TYPICALLY BEEN IMPOSED ON TEACHERS, MAKING SCHOOLS NOT UNLIKE THE 19TH CENTURY MASS PRODUCTION

INSTITUTIONS OF OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM, WILL NOT PROVIDE THAT OPPORTUNITY FOR PROFESSIONALISM, JUST AS THE INDUSTRIAL MASS PRODUCTION MODEL IS FAST GIVING WAY TO MORE FLEXIBLE MODES OF PRODUCTION AS U.S. FIRMS ATTEMPT TO BECOME MORE COMPETITIVE IN THE INTERNATIONAL MARKETPLACE.

INSTEAD, A SYSTEM IS REQUIRED IN WHICH CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IS GRANTED TO INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS AND WHERE TEACHERS WORKING TOGETHER CAN ADJUST CURRICULUM AND TEACHING TECHNIQUES TO FIT THE KINDS OF STUDENTS THE ARE EDUCATING. SUCH FREEDOM IMPLIES A COOPERATIVE ENVIRONMENT - AN ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH THERE IS CONTINUOUS INTERCHANGE AMONG TEACHERS, WHERE THEY ARE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE LEADERSHIP, WHERE THE MORE EXPERIENCED AND SKILLED TEACHERS WILL MENTOR THE YOUNGER TEACHERS, AND WHERE THERE IS A GENUINE OPPORTUNITY FOR OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE TO BE REWARDED.

TO ACCOMPLISH THIS THE CARNEGIE PROPOSALS INCLUDE THE CREATION OF A CATEGORY CALLED "LEAD TEACHERS". LEAD TEACHERS WOULD BECOME THE EDUCATION LEADERS IN THEIR SCHOOLS. THEY WOULD WORK WITH BOTH OTHER TEACHERS AND THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS AND TO WORK WITH PARENTS TO CREATE AN ATMOSPHERE OF COLLEGIALITY.

AS DESCRIBED IN THE FIRST CED REPORT, IT WOULD BE A BOTTOM UP RATHER THAN A TOP DOWN SYSTEM. THE MODELS USED TO ILLUSTRATE WHAT IS BEING SUGGESTED INCLUDE BOTH THE KIND OF AUTONOMY GRANTED TO OPERATING UNITS WITHIN BUSINESS

FIRMS AND THE MANAGING PARTNERS IN PROFESSIONAL FIRMS LIKE THOSE IN ACCOUNTING AND THE LAW. THE AUTONOMY WOULD PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADJUSTMENTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS THAT FIT THE DIVERSITY CHARACTERIZES TODAY'S STUDENTS AND WOULD CARRY WITH IT THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR TEACHERS TO DISTINGUISH THEMSELVES AND, THEREBY, TO RISE TO HIGHER LEVELS IN THEIR SCHOOLS AND IN THE PROFESSION.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

TO ACCOMPLISH SUCH A DRAMATIC TRANSFORMATION OF THE SCHOOLS WILL BE ANYTHING BUT SIMPLE. LIKE OTHER LARGE BUREAUCRACIES THERE IS TREMENDOUS INERTIA IN THE SYSTEM AND MANY TOUGH, LEGITIMATE IMPLEMENTATION QUESTIONS AS WELL. NOT THE LEAST OF THESE IS THE QUESTION ANY SCHOOL BOARD CONFRONTED WITH SUCH PROPOSALS OUGHT TO ASK - WHICH TEACHERS SHOULD BE SELECTED FOR THESE NEW POSITIONS OF INCREASED RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTONOMY? RIGHT NOW WE ARE JUST BEGINNING TO EXPERIMENT WITH VARIOUS FORMS OF PEER REVIEW TO GET AT THIS ISSUE, BUT THE RESULTS ARE HIGHLY PARTICULARISTIC TO EACH SCHOOL AND LOCAL DISTRICT AND THERE IS LITTLE IN THE WAY OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO PRODUCE MODELS OF TEACHER ASSESSMENT THAT ARE TRUSTWORTHY AND THAT FOCUS IN ANY COMPREHENSIVE MANNER ON DEFINING WHAT TEACHERS NEED TO KNOW AND BE ABLE TO DO.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS WAS DESIGNED TO PROVIDE A PARTIAL ANSWER

TO THE SCHOOL BOARD'S QUESTION AND TO SERVE SEVERAL OTHER PURPOSES AS WELL. BY SETTING HIGH AND RIGOROUS STANDARDS FOR WHAT TEACHERS NEED TO KNOW AND BE ABLE TO DO; BY DEVELOPING ASSESSMENT PROCESSES TO DETERMINE WHO MEETS THE STANDARDS AND BY ISSUING CERTIFICATES TO THOSE WHO MEET THE STANDARDS, THE BOARD WILL NOT ONLY ELEVATE THE PROFESSION AND REDEFINE WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A TEACHER, BUT IT ALSO WILL CONTRIBUTE TO THE REFORM OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS AND TO THE REDESIGN OF OUR SCHOOLS FOR IMPROVED PERFORMANCE.

IT WILL DO SO BECAUSE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION WILL COME TO CARE A GREAT DEAL ABOUT THE SUCCESS OF THEIR GRADUATES AS THEY SIT FOR THEIR "BOARDS". SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND STATES WILL BECOME INTERESTED IN ENCOURAGING CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS TO GET BOARD CERTIFIED, AND WILL DO SO BY OFFERING BOARD CERTIFIED TEACHERS BETTER SALARIES AND THE PROSPECT OF MUCH IMPROVED WORKING ENVIRONMENTS. I AM NOT THINKING HERE OF SUCH TRAPPINGS OF STATUS AS PRIVATE OFFICES AND TELEPHONES, WHICH ABSENCE TEACHERS OFTEN BEMOAN, BUT DIFFERENT JOBS THAT WILL SAY TO A BOARD CERTIFIED TEACHER, "WE TRUST YOUR CAPACITY TO MAKE INDEPENDENT PROFESSIONAL JUDGEMENTS ABOUT INSTRUCTIONAL POLICY, CURRICULUM DESIGN, RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND WILL GIVE YOU THE OPPORTUNITIES TO EXERCISE THIS CAPACITY."

NONE OF THIS WILL HAPPEN, HOWEVER, UNLESS THE BOARD SETS STANDARDS AND PUTS IN PLACE ASSESSMENT PROCESSES OF THE

HIGHEST CALIBER - PROCESSES WHICH ELECTED OFFICIALS, TEACHERS AND THE PUBLIC WILL FIND WORTHY OF THEIR TRUST. THIS, IN TURN, WILL REQUIRE MOUNTING FIRST CLASS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS TO PRODUCE ASSESSMENTS THAT REPRESENT A GREAT LEAP FORWARD FROM CURRENT PRACTICE. SUCH PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH WILL BE QUITE COSTLY IN A FIELD AS COMPLEX AS TEACHING AND WHERE HISTORICALLY THE OVERALL INVESTMENT IN R&D FROM ALL SOURCES (GOVERNMENT, FOUNDATIONS, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION) HAS BEEN QUITE MODEST. WHILE THE COST WILL BE SUBSTANTIAL, THE INVESTMENT IN R&D THAT MUST BE MADE IS NO LESS ESSENTIAL THAN THE LONG-TERM INVESTMENTS THAT BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY MUST MAKE IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TO STAY ON THE LEADING EDGE OF PRODUCT AND SERVICE DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS OFTEN PLAYED A CATALYTIC ROLE IN ADVANCING THE NATION'S CAPACITY TO MEET BOTH CRISIS SITUATIONS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES IN A WIDE VARIETY OF FIELDS. WHETHER IT WAS THE MANHATTAN PROJECT DURING THE 40'S, THE CHALLENGE OF SPACE IN THE 60'S, OR THE FIGHT AGAINST CANCER - AND NOW AIDS - IN THE 80'S, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS INVESTED IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT THAT HAS WIDE APPLICABILITY AND BENEFITS WHEN THE LONG-TERM HEALTH OF THE COUNTRY HAS BEEN AT STAKE.

THE INVESTMENT WE NEED IN EDUCATION R&D IS NOT AS GREAT AS WAS REQUIRED BY THESE OTHER INITIATIVES, BUT THE STAKES FOR THE QUALITY OF LIFE THAT AMERICA'S CITIZENS WILL ENJOY

IN THE FUTURE ARE SUBSTANTIAL. THE BOARD CLEARLY HAS OTHER POSSIBLE SOURCES OF SUPPORT, BUT NEEDS THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO STIMULATE OTHERS TO INVEST IN THE BOARD'S R&D PROGRAM. THE R&D WORK OF THE BOARD WILL HAVE MANY BENEFICIARIES, INCLUDING STATE LICENSING AGENCIES, TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS, AND TEACHERS THEMSELVES WILL BENEFIT FROM HAVING ACCESS TO RESEARCH THAT IS FOCUSED ON WHAT TEACHERS NEED TO KNOW AND BE ABLE TO DO.

PEOPLE IN THE EDUCATION COMMUNITY HAVE TALKED FOR A LONG TIME ABOUT MOVING BEYOND STATE TEACHER LICENSING SYSTEMS WHICH PROMISE ONLY THAT THOSE HOLDING THE LICENSES ARE UNLIKELY TO DO ANY HARM IF LET LOOSE IN THE SCHOOLS. THE CREATION OF THIS INDEPENDENT, NON-PROFIT BOARD THAT PROPOSES TO ESTABLISH A SYSTEM OF VOLUNTARY PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION HAS THE POTENTIAL TO SET OFF A CHAIN REACTION OF EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT THAT THE COUNTRY CANNOT AFFORD TO PASS UP.

IN FACT, FEDERAL SUPPORT OF THE NECESSARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IS AN INVESTMENT WHICH WILL PAY DIVIDENDS FOR YEARS TO COME. IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE DECENTRALIZED CHARACTER OF EDUCATION IN AMERICA WHILE RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL STAKE IN AN EDUCATION SYSTEM WHICH EDUCATES, A SYSTEM WHICH IS RESPONSIVE TO THE COMPETITIVE CHALLENGE OUR SOCIETY AND ECONOMY IS FACING AND WILL CONTINUE TO FACE INTO THE 21ST CENTURY.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Mr. Campbell. Eloquent testimony. Just as an aside, let me say I could not agree more with you about the pace at which the board has moved. Take 64 people and take a profession where you have seen what has happened—I mentioned Bill Clinton in Arkansas and other governors who have wrestled with the issue, and the political difficulties of trying to bring together Boards of Education, superintendents of schools, teachers, parents, community people and so forth, all know how difficult it is. The fact that this board has been able to develop a consensus in a profession which has been for too many years divided, I think is a remarkable accomplishment. I would just say that had the Department over the years, the last eight years, worked as hard in this area trying to develop a consensus, the teaching profession might be in a far better position.

Mr. Ambach.

Mr. AMBACH. Mr. Chairman and Senator Stafford, both of you have reviewed the tremendous need for strengthening the profession of teaching. Your first panel has presented the board's proposal. I want to move directly to the issue of funding for research and development of assessment procedures, and move then, Mr. Chairman, to comment on the six points of condition that you made earlier.

Senator DODD. By the way, those were just some ideas, and I want to get feed back from the Department and others.

Mr. AMBACH. Well, I wanted to be responsive to your opening comment to the effect that we have our testimony provided in the record, and that this exchange would really center on what are the key issues before the Senate.

Senator DODD. I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Mr. AMBACH. I realize those are not the only six either, but I think they all deserve a response.

I am representing the Council of Chief State School Officers. On this issue, the Council has not formally taken a position on the specific agenda of the board, but the council has a very deep concern about the issue of research and development funding for the procedures of assessment and for the techniques of assessment. We very strongly urge that you give positive consideration in the Senate for making such an appropriation.

We have not fixed a dollar figure. I believe that in addition to the issue of the administrative proceedings to do it, there ought to be a part of continuing discussion among the parties as to exactly how it should best be done. But the central point of our testimony is the necessity for having a Federal commitment to research and development in this area of assessment of teacher performance and teacher competence.

Now, several States have moved within the past few years very directly to change their processes for licensure. Some call it certification, but in this context we are really talking about the authority as to who shall teach. And we are calling that licensure here.

The States have moved. They have changed pre-entry requirements. They have changed assessment requirements. And many, as you pointed out earlier, are now working on the issue of what assessment technique can be put in place that will better serve us all, whether it is for certification or for licensure.

You cited the example of Connecticut and California joining together, and I might point out that in conferences to be held in the next few months, some 30 and probably more States will be joining them in a joint quest to try to get better assessment techniques.

Now, what relevance is this to the specific request of the board for R&D funding? There has been an emphasis placed so far this morning on the research element. I want to put an emphasis on the development element. Indeed, I would argue that the process of actually developing procedures and putting them into place so that they are fair, they are reliable, they have a long-standing practice, is as much of a difficulty as research. This is where the matter of the States' interest becomes particularly pertinent, because I think we have a mutual concern here. The Department of Education may have an arm's length; we see it as the States and the board having an arm's length. We have a mutual concern in expanding the capacity that we have among the States and with this board on how it is that we can, in fact, assess practice.

I put an emphasis on development, and I do that because it is not just a matter of finding out what is the particular technique that tells us whether a teacher knows the subject area and can perform. It is also a matter of having systems that last over time. I could speak specifically of this to an experience of my own of 20 years in New York where we licensed not only teachers, but we licensed 31 professions. The major task is continuity. It is fairness. It is reliability in the system. It has never been more important than it might be in the processes that are before us now, by way of being able to assess for certification of teachers.

What I am suggesting is that, as we urge a Federal commitment in this area, you consider that commitment—and I think the board would consider that commitment—would be in large part for funding research, but also in supporting the kind of developmental activities that will be necessary in the next few years to test out different procedures and different research. This can be very appropriately done in the States toward the objective of building nationwide procedures which would be used by the board.

That is where there is a linkage. That is where there is a need for support, both of State efforts and board efforts, and I think that you can, in fact, address them mutually.

So, in sum, there is a strong support of a Federal commitment here. I can tell you that the States cannot do this separately and alone. That is why they are pooling with California and Connecticut in order to do it. The board cannot do it alone. But together and with a significant, up-front, one-shot contribution from the Federal Government, I think we can make a very significant advance in something which is expressed to you as critical and which the Council believes is critical.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Ambach follows:]

President
VERNE A. DUNCAN
Oregon Superintendent
of Schools

President Elect
TED SANDERS
Illinois Superintendent
of Education

Vice President
DAVID W. HORNBECK
Maryland State Superintendent
of Schools

Directors
JERRY L. EVANS
Idaho Superintendent
of Public Instruction

HERBERT J. GROVER
Wisconsin Superintendent
of Public Instruction

WILLIAM B. KEENE
Delaware Superintendent
of Public Instruction

RUTH E. RANDALL
Minnesota Commissioner
of Education

LYNN O. SIMONS
Wyoming State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CHARLIE G. WILLIAMS
South Carolina Superintendent
of Education

Executive Director
GORDON M. AMBACH

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHER ASSESSMENT

The Council Statement Presented by

Gordon M. Ambach
Executive Director
Council of Chief State School Officers

Before the Senate
Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities,
Labor and Human Resources Committee

February 18, 1988

Education
. . . a sound
investment in
AMERICA.

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
379 Hall of the States, 400 North Capitol Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001 • [illegible]

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the members of the Council of Chief State School Officers, I thank you for the opportunity to join in this hearing which focuses on the newly-established National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and the issue of federal support for research and development of elementary and secondary school teacher assessments.

The quality of elementary and secondary education in America will only be as strong as the quality of our teachers. Our nation has been fortunate to have benefitted from the service of so many dedicated teachers who have committed their careers to the next generations. We appreciate their service. At the same time we extend our thanks, we must note that the professional practice of teaching is at a most critical juncture in our nation. There are strong reasons for action to strengthen the profession: competition for talent in other occupations and professions; relatively low salaries compared to other occupations and professions with similar training and preparation; and, the lack of societal status and long-term career incentives for continuing practice in the profession.

Americans expect more from the educational system than ever before, and they expect more from teachers than in the past. To meet the expectation, this nation must make a greater commitment to attract, prepare, and support teachers.

The teaching profession can be strengthened only if several steps are taken simultaneously: more vigorous and successful recruitment; increased quality of initial preparation; better processes of induction and first-year practice; continuous opportunity for professional growth; increase in salaries; and, changes in classroom and school practice to better nurture creativity, independence of decision making, and career satisfaction.

The new National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has been established independently with the intention of improving the status of the profession, particularly through new processes for recognizing "certified" teacher performance. Our understanding is that the new Board is now setting its overall directions and priorities, and its long-term operational plans and research agenda.

Our Council has not taken a formal position on the Board's operation. We are waiting for the specifics of its priorities, directions and research agenda before setting the Council's position. The success and productivity of the new Board will depend upon two key factors: (1) the new Board's process for certification must not impinge on or supersede state authority to determine the qualifications for a teacher to practice in the profession; and (2) the new Board's focus must be on the process of "certification" which recognizes strong levels of a teacher's experience, knowledge, and performance in professional practice.

The key to the Board's success will be in developing effective and acceptable practices for assessing, or determining, certification status. This task necessitates a long-term and substantial investment in research and development. Financing that task is at the core of this hearing.

During the past several years, many of the states and state education agencies have revised requirements for licensure or certification of teachers. These actions involve changes in the use of entry-level examinations, pre-service course preparation, and techniques for assessing teacher performance. In some states, new techniques for assessment have been started or are on the drawing boards.

Assessing capacity to teach and competence in teaching performance must now be more comprehensive and complex than in the past. Substantial research and demonstration on teacher assessment is needed. The results of an investment in research and development are necessary, both for the work of the new Board and for the several states.

Our Council, therefore, supports the investment of federal funds for an agenda of research and development to create better assessment techniques and instruments. Such research and development of techniques useful for the states could go hand in hand with that needed by the new Board. The Board may need to engage some of the states in demonstration of new practice in order to establish effectiveness and efficiency of new approaches before they are put on a nationwide basis. A federally-funded research and development agenda should target a considerable part of the funds for demonstration and development work in state systems.

Our Council has not laid out a specific target figure for an R&D teacher assessment agenda, nor have we proposed a particular procedure through which federal funding should be administered. The need for support is clear, however, and we would be pleased, Mr. Chairman, to participate in additional discussions toward the objective of establishing the right appropriation target and administrative procedure.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to participate in this important hearing, the results of which, we hope, will help to strengthen the professional practice of teaching in the United States.

Senator DODD. Dr. Wilsford.

Dr. WILSFORD. Senator Dodd, Senator Stafford, I am very tempted to get into the argument of accountability and how a National Teaching Standards Board should be financed because the discussion has been so exciting. However, I am a local school superintendent, and I probably do not know enough to talk about it.

Senator DODD. You probably have a lot of good ideas.

Dr. WILSFORD. I represent the American Association of School Administrators, my organization, and I represent Orangeburg School District #5. Our school district has participated with the South Carolina State Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Education, and the National Governors' Association in a new and unique project called "Project Education Reform: Time For Results." That is a project which has focused on the removal of many regulatory barriers to get the reform activities into place, and we have been very successful.

One of our most interesting avenues has been to work with our teachers on the lead teacher concept out of the two reports, "Teaching for the 21st Century" and the Time for Results: 1991 report on Education. We have had a committee of teachers elected by teachers working on the concept for over a year. They had some seed money of $40,000 to do their own background studies on things, like how much should lead teachers be paid, how should they be organized, and what is the criteria for their selection.

The long and the short of it is that we can do those reform activities locally, and we are doing many of them very well. However, there are some reform activities that we cannot do locally. One of those is to establish national standards for teachers. That is what I would like to talk about.

I do not think that national standards can be done easily at the State level. The States were very aggressive in the reform activities of the past five years. Most of the improvements that I have read about have focused on establishing minimum requirements for teacher licensing, not maximum requirements. And most of the evaluation systems which followed that licensing also focused upon minimum classroom performance.

So I think we are into an area where we definitely have a common problem across the States, a national problem. All of us need to give it particular attention. I can see in my work in Orangeburg School District #5 a certain limitation on what I am doing without national certification. The teachers are simply not there to do the quality of work that we need to do if we are going to meet the challenge of the future.

Let me give you some personal examples. I taught school until I was 36 and quit teaching because I needed more money. That is exactly the position today's teachers find themselves in. Had we had the kind of certification standards board that we are talking about to set standards for teachers, where a teacher might be worth more than just every other teacher on the salary schedule; then perhaps I would be, as your best witnesses have been today, a teacher. Such is not the case.

Also from my particular perspective, I have children who are now six years old, 486 of them who are in the first grade, and they will see the 21st century in ways that none of us will. They are

going to see it from eyes that have not seen the experiences of our past either. They are going to see an emerging population of older people, not younger people. Three workers are going to have to make enough money to support one retiree. All of us know that. We have read it over and over again. One of these three workers is going to be of a minority group. That is a difficult burden to place on each three citizens in the upcoming century. But with the emerging world economy, they also are going to have to compete against the best from all over the world; and we are not doing a good job, in my generation, of competing now. If we do not make some serious changes, they are going to be in deep trouble.

They are going to live in a world of high technology. It is interesting in my town in Orangeburg, South Carolina, that the unskilled jobs have already left for Mexico and the Indies and Korea. I cannot let these first graders think that there is upward mobility of the kind their parents had at that level of training. It is not going to be there.

They are going to live in a world where there is going to be rapid change. So they will have to move and re-move. The idea of being place-bound for these young people is not available to them. They cannot move into a suburb of Washington, D.C. with their folks as teenagers and expect that that is the place where they can work and make their living for the rest of their lives. It is going to be extremely different. They are also going to have to be retrained for job after job as the markets change. Finally, as a debtor Nation, they are going to find out something that none of us has ever experienced, or perhaps we are just beginning to experience, and that is that we no longer control our own economic fate, much less the economic fate of the world. That is going to shape many of the things that will have to happen to these six year olds.

Well, my little six-year-olds sitting in Orangeburg, South Carolina, today are going to have to face a world that is so much more competitive than the one I faced. I can hardly realize what they are going to be up against. I hear in that context debates on this is a great and noble idea, it ought to be done. It has been pointed out in several of the major reform studies, but we do not have the mechanisms to do it, or our previous kinds of activities do not run that way.

Reform ought to hit Washington just like it hit Orangeburg, South Carolina, if it is going to be effective. It can be done if we want it to be done. My school district has a view of the future that is written and established and agreed to by the board members, and I hope by most of the teachers. The district work centers on a view of the 21st century where the young will finish school capable of competing in and coping with the political, economic and social environment of the time. In that time, the best and the brightest will be teachers of our young, and the best and most sophisticated systems of management and learning will be at their disposal.

We need the help of this Senate committee to provide this window of opportunity so that those best and brightest can be teachers. There are going to be a lot of people who will benefit if you approve this activity, the most important of which will be the teaching profession. The teaching profession can offer a new horizon in salary and status for students entering college, higher than

teachers now working have. Teachers leave because of a lack of that horizon, because of mundane paperwork, because it is just hard, hard work to have 30 youngsters in a class for six periods a day.

This can be a beginning to turn that around. This activity, if it were funded, would also create a great wealth of research needed to set the national standards. But beyond setting the national standards, that research could be mined over and over and over by all of us as we get ourselves equipped to meet these new challenges coming upon us.

For a school district like mine which is trying very hard to establish an optimal lead teacher concept, and a new and different kind of management concept at the district level, to draw upon the nationally certified teachers as people who would be good prospects to serve as lead teachers would be a great advantage.

One interesting point here, just as an aside, some of my very best teachers do not want to be lead teachers.

Senator DODD. They do not want to be?

Dr. WILSFORD. They do not want to be lead teachers because they have two or three children, and they have to get breakfast ready in the morning. They have certain things that they cannot do and be a lead teacher. So it works out perfectly between those who want to be and those who do not want to be when you talk to them about extra responsibility, and summer work to build curriculum and the other kinds of things that go with it. Those excellent teachers will still be excellent teachers, and we need those teachers.

We also think that you will have set the national course of educational policy on the most cost-efficient and practical course as we move into the 21st century. From my particular point way down in the countryside, I think you are addressing the most significant issue that we have before us in education today.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Wilsford follows:]

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING

February 12, 1988

Education, Arts, and Humanities Sub-Committee
Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee
The Senate of the United States
Washington, DC

Dear Senators:

Please accept this statement as an endorsement by the American Association of School Administrators of the current effort to obtain federal funding for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. As with any organization as large as ours, there is some diversity of viewpoints. However, our leadership sees tremendous benefits emerging from the national effort to establish professional teaching standards.

The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy in A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century and the National Governors' Association in Time for Results: the Governors' 1991 Report on Education have made the case for a highly trained and competent teaching force in the years just ahead.

Their findings are reinforced by the major demographic studies of this decade:

* An emerging population of older people. Only three workers will support each retiree.

* An ever growing minority population. One of three of the workers will be minority. Fast food wages will not support the retirement of the older population.

* An emerging world economy. Our students of today must compete against the very best in the world tomorrow.

* A world of high technologies and tele-communications. Unskilled jobs that are available will be in the third world.

* A work world of rapid change. Jobs will require our workers to be capable of rapid re-training and re-deployment.

* The U.S., a debtor nation. We will have less and less control over our own economy and little if any control

(703) 528-0700
1801 North Moore Street • Arlington, Virginia 22209
An Equal Opportunity Employer

over the world economy.

The key to winning the great competitive battle in which we are already engaged is a better educated, more enlightened, more flexible, and more adaptable citizenry and work force. Our individual and national future is inseparably connected to the education of our young today--a more powerful and diversified education than we now offer.

My school district--Orangeburg (SC) School District Five--has stated our goal for the future succinctly:

> The district's work centers on a view of the 21st century, where the young will finish school capable of competing in and coping with the political, economic, and social environment of the time. In that time, the best and brightest will be teachers of our young; and the best and most sophisticated systems of management and learning will be at their disposal.

That the best and the brightest are not now remaining in or entering the teaching profession is a matter of record. There are a lot of reasons:

* Teachers are among the most poorly paid of our college graduates. Very often teachers make less than the amount that the Department of Labor describes as the amount necessary for a moderate standard of living.

* Teachers are over burdened with paper work and mundane non-teaching tasks.

* Teachers are not empowered to meet the needs of the students in their charge.

* There is no opportunity for professional advancement, except a move to administration or higher education.

* There are no national standards that separate excellent teachers from the average and mediocre. (It is interesting to note that most state efforts at teacher evaluation and certification focus on minimum standards of training and performance. Indeed, in many cases, practice dictates that the minimum has become the maximum.)

Our present teaching force is not equipped for the demands of the future. Perhaps we cannot take all the steps that are needed to prepare our national teaching force for the 21st century. We can, however, take one step, a giant step forward. Building on the reform studies of this decade, we can step forward and fund the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

As I am sure you are aware, the job of identifying the

is a large order. To do it district by district and state by state all across this great country will be time-wasting and cost-inefficient, if possible at all.

We need a solution to this national problem.

The benefits will be great:

* The teaching profession can offer a new horizon in salary and status for students entering college and teachers now working .

* The great wealth of research needed to set the national standards will be mined over and over again as we equip our teachers and students for the 21st century.

* School districts can use the nationally certified teachers in new organizational strategies for the future; such as the one my district is developing, using the best teachers as lead teachers.

* We will have set national educational policy on the most cost-efficient and practical course as we move into the 21st century.

As the authorized representative of the American Association of School Administrators and as the Superintendent of Orangeburg (SC) School District Five, I request your individual and collective support of federal funding for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Wilsford, Superintendent
Orangeburg School District Five
Orangeburg, SC 29115

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Dr. Wilsford. Excellent testimony, and particularly having heard from Ms. Kaplan, a teacher, and then to hear from a superintendent in a local school district, your comments are particularly helpful and noteworthy.

Just a couple points. Dr. Finn, if I can, help me clarify. Let me tell you what I think I heard you say about this, and you tell me if I'm misreading what you said about it. Okay?

You nor the Department, to the extent you speak for the Administration, are not flatly opposed to Federal support for the board. You have not rejected that. You also are not asking for a veto over the activities of the board, but you feel that there should be some plan, a research plan that would be submitted at some point.

Could you in a concise way tell me whether or not I am on target with those reactions?

Dr. FINN. Well, we certainly have not said "never" or "no way." We have said that a research agenda from the board ought to be subjected to the kinds of expert review procedures that customarily accompany Federal review of requests for research funds. But to date, as I have said, we have seen no such plan, nor has the board——

Senator DODD. Do you think that is something we ought to have as a plan before we would consider legislation?

Dr. FINN. Yes, sir. I do not think a Federal dollar should ever go anywhere without having been told in advance what it is going to be spent for. I do not think that——

Senator DODD. The more general principles rather than the specifics, of the research?

Dr. FINN. Well, customarily, when we fund a research center at a university, for a five-year period of time, the initial submission, which our peer reviewers evaluate, lays out in detail the first year or two of research plans, and specifies which studies the Center intends to carry out and how they intend to go about it.

Then after the second year or during the third year, the university generally comes back in, with a detailed plan for the next couple of years. So this is the customary way of proceeding. I think it is a fair way of proceeding, and it does not, as I said, shackle their intellectual freedom.

We are not seeking to veto their findings. We think the peer review process should have the opportunity to review their plans before they are undertaken; and that we should not be asked here for sort of a pig-in-a-poke approach.

Senator DODD. I went down those six or seven points. I do not know if you were present. I was not sure.

Dr. FINN. Yes, sir. I was.

Senator DODD. Did that cover the ground for you, or did I not go far enough?

Dr. FINN. Well, you certainly were moving in the right direction, and I appreciate that.

I think that one of the crucial questions is who decides which topics are going to be studied, and who is going to do the studying. Those are the usual important issues in a research funding decision.

The board appears to be asking for the prerogative, both to pick its topics over time and to decide who is going to do the studies and

the way in which they are going to be done. Now, ordinarily, we would expect any such plan to be subjected to disinterested review by experts in the field who do not work for and are not associated with the people proposing to do the work, as well as by our own staff. I am not sure I have heard that concept embraced yet, either by the board or in your list of procedures—though you certainly included some useful ones.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much.

Mr. Campbell, you mentioned that the corporate community is willing to help the board financially. That is vitally important. I think what is becoming apparent is that the business community, to cite your anecdote, is not just trying to be nice, in the case of the homework in many cases is not being helpful, but now recognizes the direct immediate self-interest of being involved in elementary and secondary education. I know in my own State of Connecticut, in Bridgeport, the Bridgeport Compact, the business community and the local education community has become directly involved because the business community saw that group of at-risk children no longer being a small percentage that they would not even come close to hitting as their projected employment needs. Rather, they have now witnessed that within the greater Bridgeport area that their potential employment pool runs right into that growing number of children at risk. So they see not in 20 years or 10 years, but immediately, an absolute need to become involved in the local educational effort.

Do you see this nationally? Aside from the financial commitments that you think the corporate community is willing to make to the board, do you sense—and maybe you could cite some examples, Sara Lee being one, I know, in Chicago. I see Al Shanker in the back there. There have been examples in New York where you have had individuals that have adopted or gone into classrooms. How broadly based is this? Is this kind of nice stories we are reading here and there, or do you see an absolute commitment of a deeper involvement than the donation of a computer or writing out a check to support something like this board from the corporate community in this country?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it is a mixed picture and sometimes overstated as to the degree to which there is extensive business involvement. There certainly is more than was true in the past.

Second, there are a number of corporations—U.S. West to name one—that has recently announced that they are putting up a very substantial amount of money to invest in education changes. There are certainly individuals who have played major leadership rules: Brad Butler, the retired chairman of P&G, as well as others.

The real issue is whether the business community, to the degree one can speak of what is a very disparate and broad community, in providing the type of support activities represented by programs such as Adopt-A-School which have been undertaken in many places—my own company has done that at a high school in Los Angeles and one in Philadelphia where we have made some useful contributions—is reaching the root of the problem.

And I think it fair to say that in a variety of different forums, the business community is now discussing issue of effectiveness with itself. I think it is a time in which the National Board has a

window of opportunity. The National Board is going to have to convince corporations that this, indeed, is relevant to the problems. I would make the point very strongly that there is some impatience in the business community: "What do you mean, it is going to take three to five years? We have a problem now." There is going to be pressure from the business community to try to move this along faster than it has been proceeding.

But I think the opportunity is there. I am very impressed by the National Conference Board's annual survey of the business community, where now almost two-thirds are saying the top domestic problem in this country is education. Hopefully, the issue will enter the public dialogue in the presidential campaign in a way that will serve the interest of doing something about it.

So I am encouraged, but I do not want to overstate that there is a great readiness out there on the part of the business community to move. That would not be true.

Senator DODD. I hear you. I thank both of you, as well, Mr. Ambach, and again, Superintendent, for your comments. Let me turn to my colleague, Bob Stafford. I am taking a little too much time in the discussions.

Senator STAFFORD. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Coming from Calvin Coolidge territory in Vermont, I will make up some of the time here.

Mr. Campbell, I was intrigued with your titles, and I as a country Senator, I will have to confess I am not familiar with ARA services. Could you tell us very briefly what their services are?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes. I am delighted to. Always happy for the opportunity.

Senator STAFFORD. Are the cameras rolling over here?

[Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. We are a multi-service corporation. We have 16 lines of business. Food service is one of our major efforts. We also are in nursing homes, early childhood education. We have 500 child care centers across the United States. We are in uniform rental, and we are in health care. We run emergency rooms in 300 hospitals. We provide medical services to prisons, including the State of Alabama, the State of Georgia, most of Illinois, and see ourselves as a corporation that in some areas operates in those fields where there is an overlapping area between the public sector and the private sector.

As you may know, I did spend some time in this town. I was chairman of the Civil Service Commission during the Carter years and was involved in the civil service reform and the creation of the Office of Personnel Management, and have some views in terms of the need for education and training in relation to that job as well.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much.

I just have one question, Dr. Finn, of you, and that is: Even though this may be slightly redundant from earlier testimony, would you describe with some brevity the customary procedures that are used by your Department to grant Federal funds for research and development?

Dr. FINN. Yes, Senator. I described a four-part process. First, the applicant has to submit a detailed plan as to just what they intend to do and how they intend to do it. Second, expert peer reviewers

chosen by us from institutions not applying for funds review these plans, and let us know whether they think these are well conceived or whether somebody else's plan is better conceived or more economical. Third, there are periodic submissions of progress reports and products based on the work being done, and those in turn are also reviewed by expert, disinterested reviewers from other institutions. Sometimes mid-course corrections are made in the research plan on the basis of the reviews of the progress reports and products as they come in. This assumes something that is going on over several years.

Finally, and fourth—and I am sure least controversial—is the sort of fiduciary responsibility to make sure that the funds were expended for the purposes intended.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. Let me join the chairman in thanking all of you on the panel for joining us today. We appreciate your help.

Senator DODD. Thank you all very much.

I will invite our last panel to join us. Again, we always award the patience medals to the last panels. You have had the opportunity now to listen to all of the other testimony, so you get the last crack at comment.

Mary Futrell, well known to all of us, is the president of the National Education Association. Albert Shanker, also extremely well known to all of us, is the president of the American Federation of Teachers. Dr. Barbara Hatton, program officer, the Ford Foundation Education and Culture Program, I might add is a former professor and dean of the School of Education as Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. And Mr. Bradley Blanchette, high school English teacher, 1986 Vermont Teacher of the Year, Colchester, Vermont.

Senator STAFFORD. May I say a word here?

Senator DODD. Absolutely. I suspect Bob here wants to welcome you, Mr. Blanchette.

Senator STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Blanchette and I had a chance to meet for a few minutes yesterday, but I am grateful that you have indicated his distinguished teaching record in Vermont. He is an English teacher at Colchester High School, and he was Vermont's 1986 Outstanding Teacher of the Year. He received from my alma mater, Middlebury College, the Challenger/Christa McAuliffe Award for Excellence. Furthermore, he was awarded a scholarship to study the teaching of English at Oxford University in the United Kingdom.

So I am delighted he is here, and I look forward to hearing his testimony. I will say that I have often heard Mary Futrell speak and have known her very pleasantly through the NEA. And, Mr. Shanker, I have met with you before. Dr. Hatton, I am delighted you are here.

Senator DODD. Is this an English teacher as well? Are you an English teacher?

Mr. BLANCHETTE. Yes.

Senator DODD. We must have a run on English teachers here today. With dangling participles and the like, I am going to watch what I say now very carefully. I have admitted that I was an English major in college.

We welcome all of you. We will begin in the order that I have introduced you. Again, welcome. It is an honor to have all of you here before us this morning. Again, your testimony will all be made a part of the record. It will be interesting if you could play off some of the testimony. I know you may not have been here, but if you were, then play off some of the comments you have heard. It would be helpful this morning.

STATEMENTS OF MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, DC; ALBERT SHANKER, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, WASHINGTON, DC; DR. BARBARA HATTON, PROGRAM OFFICER, FORD FOUNDATION EDUCATION AND CULTURE PROGRAM, NEW YORK, NY, AND FORMER PROFESSOR AND DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE, AL; AND BRADLEY BLANCHETTE, HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHER, 1986 VERMONT TEACHER OF THE YEAR, COLCHESTER, VT

Ms. FUTRELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First let me say to Senators Dodd and Stafford it is, indeed, a pleasure to be here this morning and to have an opportunity to testify regarding the National Standards Board request for funding from the Federal Government. I am certain you will agree that a sound and excellent educational system is central to our Nation's social and economic future. Yet in order to achieve excellence and equity in education, there must be a qualified teacher in every classroom.

Let me digress and say for a moment that we have come a long way. If you look at the credentials of the teachers in America, you will find that 99.7 percent of them do have a Bachelor's degree, and over half of them have a Master's degree, even though they are not required to do so. So we believe that the teachers are probably better prepared, better trained than they have ever been before, but that does not mean that we could not do and should not do a much better job, especially in light of the fact that, as you have heard this morning, the student population is changing dramatically. We are going to receive a much higher percentage of young people coming into our schools who have been less well served. Thirty-five percent of the children will be minorities. Over 50 percent will come from families living in poverty. When we look at the structure of the family in America, that too is changing dramatically and will have a significant impact on our ability to provide quality education.

So it is absolutely imperative, we believe, that we have the best qualified people possible in our schools working with our young people, and that every single child have access to those outstanding teachers.

We also recognize that the best way to ensure that there is a qualified teacher in every classroom is for the teachers themselves to determine who is qualified to practice in the field of education. We believe that the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards can play an important role not only in establishing but also in maintaining higher standards for the teaching profession, and ultimately for America's students.

NEA Members support voluntary, professional certification by a National Standards Board that is composed of a majority of practicing public school teachers. We believe that this board should establish procedures by which individuals should demonstrate competency in both pedagogy and subject matter areas, and, I might add, a demonstrated ability to teach all kinds of children, because that is absolutely critical.

We are pleased at the board's progress so far, I would agree particularly with the comments made by Scotty Campbell and by Chairman Hunt, that in three years, we have to a large degree performed almost an impossible feat. But the most difficult part of our mission is yet to come.

I am convinced that this board will affirm to policymakers that classroom teachers must have the authority to govern the profession and, further, that they must have the authority to make professional choices in the classroom on a day-to-day basis. All the research indicates that the best schools in America are the ones where the decisions are made at the building level by the people who are responsible for delivering education.

The first stage in this process will be to establish concrete data on what knowledge, skills, and talents are required to be a good teacher. I would agree with Mr. Finn that we know a lot about what it takes to be a good teacher. But we need to know more, and we need to bring those data together and utilize them as we prepare teachers for the future.

Then, we need to develop tools for assessing these qualifications to do a much better job than we have done before. We are not simply talking about a paper or pencil test. We are talking about teachers demonstrating that they do, indeed, have the knowledge and the skills, and that they know how to apply what they have learned to the everyday classroom situation.

The goal is not to prescribe a single model of pedagogy. In other words, we are not claiming a national curriculum; we are not claiming that there is one way to prepare teachers. But what we are saying is find the best way, and we hope that those individuals will demonstrate that ability, and that they will be able to meet the high standards set by the National Board.

The goal is to establish high standards for certification and mechanisms for measuring a candidate's professional capabilities. True self-governance over who shall enter the teaching profession demands that the National Board remain independent. I would like to underscore that. The board should not be a branch of Government, nor should it be perceived as such. The assessments used for certification must be empirical, not political.

In order to achieve full autonomy, the board has proposed that support for the activities we are advancing come from foundations, from individuals interested in improving the teaching profession, and ultimately from fees of those seeking certification. However, the board is still some years away from granting its first certificate. I would caution us against moving forward to expedite the process so that we can hurry up and issue certificates. I think it is very, very important that we do a very thorough job of making sure that the research we put in the place, the assessment instru-

ment we develop, that everything we do is of the highest, highest possible caliber.

That might take a little longer than some people are willing to wait, but we cannot make mistakes. We need to be very, very careful and very thorough regarding what we do.

Therefore, the National Education Association has come to believe that for this endeavor to be successful and to be of the highest possible caliber, some Federal assistance is necessary and is appropriate. Not only would such Federal assistance provide the resources to fund the necessary research, but it would also send a signal to other potential contributors that establishing and maintaining the highest standards for the teaching profession is truly in the national interest of America.

Federal assistance for this initial research function of the board must be free, as I indicated, of preconceptions about what the results of that research would be. Board-supported research should reflect the conclusions of educational researchers and educators, and not, for example, those of the Department of Education or any other entity subject to political forces. Any congressional appropriations provided for research related to activities of the board should be free from any damaging, constraining, or non-germane amendment.

Moreover, Federal funds allocated to the board by the Congress must not come from any existing federally supported education program, nor should it preempt funding from other education programs deserving of support.

Finally, the Federal Government's role must be to encourage funding from other sources, not to serve as the primary and continuing contributor to the board. I would underscore again what other representatives of the board have said. It is not our intention that the Federal Government continue to provide funding forever, but only for a designated period of time.

In conclusion, let me say that no one cares more about the quality of the public educational system than do the men and women currently working in the teaching profession. Throughout its history, NEA has been committed to elevating the teaching profession and promoting the cause of public education. We believe that the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards can make a significant contribution to these goals, and we look forward to working with you in cooperative efforts to achieve true excellence and equity in education.

Thank you, and I will be very happy to respond to questions when you are ready to raise questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Futrell follows:]

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

TESTIMONY

OF THE

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

BEFORE THE

LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

OF THE

U.S. SENATE

PRESENTED BY

MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL

NEA PRESIDENT

FEBRUARY 18, 1987

MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL, President • KEITH GEIGER, Vice President • ROXANNE E. BRADSHAW, Secretary-Treasurer
DON CAMERON, Executive Director
(202) 822-7300

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Mary Hatwood Futrell, president of the National Education Association which represents nearly 1.9 million education employees in elementary and secondary, vocational, and postsecondary education institutions. I appreciate the opportunity to share with you our views on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

I come before you today with a very simple message. First, a sound and excellent educational system is central to our nation's social and economic future. Second, in order to achieve excellence and equity in education there must be a qualified teacher in every classroom. Third, education professionals must have the degree of autonomy and responsibility common to other professions so they can meet the diverse needs of America's public school students. Fourth, the best way to ensure there is a qualified teacher in every classroom is for professional educators themselves to determine who is qualified to practice in the field of education. Finally, the national Board can play an important role in establishing and maintaining high standards for the teaching profession and ultimately America's students.

We are at a critical juncture in our nation's history. More and more Americans look to our educational system for the salvation of our economy, our national security, and our social and political institutions. There is no question that what we as a nation do in the next few years in terms of educational policies, procedures, and resources is the key factor in determining our nation's future.

Our educational system — from preschool to graduate school — should be dedicated to equipping the nation's young people with the intellectual, social, and technical skills to ensure our nation's continued progress. Such an educational system requires qualified teachers at every level who have the support and respect of our nation. A National Board is an important step toward meeting that challenge.

Throughout our history, NEA has been dedicated to improving the teaching profession. That is why we participated in the establishment of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, as well as the preparation of the Carnegie Task Force's report, "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century," which proposed the creation of such a Board.

Some 7,500 NEA members, delegates to our Representative Assembly, passed Resolution G-2. on Certification outlining our view of what the function of a national Board should be.

> "The National Education Association supports voluntary professional certification by which the profession grants recognition to an individual who has met qualifications specified by the profession. The Association asserts that this function must be fulfilled by a national standards Board of professional educators that is composed of a majority of practicing public school teachers.
>
> "The national standards Board of professional educators should establish appropriate assessment procedures by which individuals may demonstrate competence in pedagogy and in subject matter areas, should issue permanent certificates to all individuals who meet the criteria as established by the national Board, and should maintain a roster of those who have been certified."

We are pleased at the progress so far in the establishment of this Board. Of the 63 members of the Board, 42 are classroom teachers, and I believe they represent some of the finest individuals in our profession. I am convinced that this Board will affirm to policymakers that classroom teachers must have the authority to govern their profession, and further, that they must have the authority to make professional choices in the classroom on a day to day basis.

A national Board is not the final or ultimate step. Even after the Board is fully operational, there will still be a need for state entities responsible for licensing and professional standards. But the national Board can provide leadership and guidance to these state boards.

The first stage in this process will be to establish concrete data on what knowledge, skills, and talents are required to be a good teacher, and then to develop tools for assessing these qualifications. This process has already begun, in part, in a research project at Stanford University. The goal is not to prescribe a single model of pedagogy. The goal is to establish high standards for certification and mechanisms for measuring a candidate's professional capabilities.

Our members aspire to educate all students to the highest possible standards. This goal demands a vast public commitment to our schools, and it demands a new repertoire of strategies from teachers. What works for some teachers does not necessarily work for others; what works for teachers with some students does not necessarily work for all. Self-governance will assure that

all those certified by the national Board possess the knowledge and skills required to implement appropriate student learning strategies. State governments must permit the profession to break the cycle of relaxed standards which have too often allowed poorly prepared and unqualified individuals in the classroom.

True self-governance over who shall enter the teaching profession demands that the national Board remain independent. The credibility and effectiveness of the Board — and of individuals certified by the Board — depends on the Board's ability to function free of legislative fiat or political winds.

What we hope to achieve through a national Board is the kind of professional autonomy granted other professions, including medicine, law, and accounting, to name a few. Of course, the make-up of the Board includes "public and other education" members reflecting the public interest and governance structure of elementary and secondary education. But the Board should not be a branch of government, nor should it be perceived as such. The assessments used for certification must be empirical, not political.

In order to achieve full autonomy, the Board has proposed that support for the Board's activities should come from foundations, individuals interested in improving the teaching profession, and ultimately the fees of those seeking certification. However, at this stage of development the Board is still some years away from granting its first certificate. The NEA has come to believe that for this endeavor to be successful, some federal assistance is necessary and appropriate. Not only would such federal

assistance provide the needed resources to fund research to develop empirical assessments of what makes a good teacher, but it would also send a signal to other potential contributors that the work of the Board — establishing and maintaining the highest standards for the teaching profession — is truly in the national interest.

Given that autonomy is an essential element of the Board, federal assistance for this initial research function of the Board must be free of encumbrances or preconceptions about what the results of that research would be. The results of Board-supported research should reflect the conclusions of educational researchers, not of the Congress, the U.S. Department of Education, or any other entity subject to political forces. Any Congressional appropriations provided for research related to activities of the Board should be free from any damaging, constraining, or nongermane amendments.

Moreover, federal funds allocated to the Board by the Congress must not come from any existing federally supported education program, nor should it preempt funding from other education programs deserving of support. Finally, the federal government's role must be to encourage and support funding from other sources, not to serve as the primary and continuing contributor to the Board.

In conclusion, let me say that no one cares more about a quality public educational system than do the men and women currently working in the teaching profession. Throughout its history, NEA has been committed to elevating the teaching

profession and promoting the cause of public education. We believe that the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards can make a significant contribution to these goals, and we look forward to working with you in cooperative efforts to achieve true excellence and equity in education.

Thank you.

Senator DODD. Thank you very, very much for your testimony. Mr. Shanker, we welcome you.

Mr. SHANKER. Mr. Chairman, Senator Stafford, thank you very much for this opportunity. I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your concerned interest in pursuit of this matter, which is so important.

Who would have thought a few years ago that the two organizations [AFT and NCA] representing about 95 percent of America's teachers would be willing to accept the concept that you can create a differentiated teaching force that some teachers are certified and some are licensed but not certified, and that this distinction might be used in such a way as to reorganize schools, create different roles for teachers, create different incentives, create different systems of compensation, depending upon the willingness of the parties at the local and State level? This concept, and the possibility for its realization, is truly revolutionary and an opportunity that needs to be seized, especially at this time.

Let me emphasize the issue of time, of haste even. We have followed the teacher demographics, and we know what is happening. In the next six or seven years, about one-half of the teachers of this country will either be retiring or leaving for other reasons. That is about 1.2 million that will be leaving. We will need about 23 percent of all the college graduates, each and every year, to enter teaching.

A few years ago, at the time of the beginning of the various education reform reports, only about four percent of the students in college said they were heading into teaching. A few years later, it went up to six percent. Now, it's about 10 percent, which is an indication that the demonstrations of concern by governors, by various task forces, and, indeed, by Federal officials also have brought more people into the line eager and willing to become teachers. We are still, though, only about halfway there in terms of needs. More important, these numbers don't tell us anything about the quality of those who are lined up to enter teaching. Are we getting our fair share of the best and brightest?

The development of an assessment for teacher certification is the most important point of leverage that we have at the current time for securing the necessary quantity and quality of teachers. It will say to large numbers of youngsters who are thinking of coming our way that teaching will no longer be a flat profession, where you have achieved everything the minute you walk in, where the only way you can advance is to get out of it and do something else—whether it is school administration or school supervision or out of education altogether. It will be a message to people who could be top-notch in any field that they can be top-notch and recognized in teaching, that they need not go to other fields because there are opportunities for recognition and advancement in this one. In other words, Board-certification for teachers has the potential to alter the demographic problems that we are facing in our very important field.

I think it is also important to say that, at this time when we are starting actually to refill about half the teaching positions in this nation, it make a tremendous difference whether those positions get filled by people who are in the bottom quartile of all college

graduates, or whether they are filled by people who are in the first, second and third quartile in terms of a decent spread of talents and abilities.

We will be living with this not-too-distant teacher work force for quite a long period in the future. I think even if this Board were able to raise all its own research and development money and raise it quickly, there is good reason for the Federal Government to be a partner. I think the message that it would send to those who are in college about the national concern for and the importance of teaching would be electrifying. When different people are asked, "What do you do," most people are very proud of their answer, but teachers almost always answer, "Well, I am *only* a teacher." Teachers must get a different feeling about themselves and about their profession. This Federal commitment and Federal involvement would be a very important step in that direction.

But the other part of that step, very closely related to it, as many others have said today, is the notion that it is time that others stopped setting down the rules and regulations for teachers from above. That is part of a problem that we have in industry; it is a problem that we have in government. Yet almost all the books we get today about excellence and how to become competitive deal with the issue of how to get people to participate, to buy in, to feel part of something, to give more of themselves than one gives in a bureaucracy or in most institutions.

That is why it is so important that these standards be developed and set by a Board that is made up of a majority of people within the K–12 teaching profession. You do not want something that, three or five or seven years from now, causes the overwhelming majority of American teachers to say, "Well, who developed that? Who came up with it? Once again, someone else is doing it to us." We would like to be able to go out and say: "This was developed by teachers. There were others on the Board, but the majority were practicing teachers. There were school administrators and governors, and there were business people and others representing the public, but this whole thing was put together and developed by the teaching profession itself. It is something you can and should be proud of, and it is something that you can support. It is a parallel development to what historically took place in other professions."

Now I would like to address an issue that has been implicitly raised here and that may be on your minds. That question is, is there anything new in this endeavor, don't we already know what works in education, don't we already have fine standards and assessment instruments? First, I would like to ask, if we know as much as some people have asserted that we know, then why are the student results so bad? And they, indeed, are very bad. We do know more than we are using, so it is important that we get what is known more widely used. But there is an awful lot that we do not know, and it is time for us to face up to this fact in education.

Second, there is currently no instrument that is nationally available that makes any sense in terms of either the employment of teachers or the certification or licensing of teachers. The assessment instruments that are around now that are nationally available are basically literacy exams or minimal competency exams. Licensing standards, which will continue to be State-set standards,

are largely governed by supply and demand. There is not a single classroom in America that is ever empty because States and districts always go out and hire the most available persons, no matter what their qualifications or lack of qualifications. And given the fact that our schools are custodial, as well as educational institutions that will likely continue to be the case.

So we need something that is separate from licensing and hiring standards, and we need an instrument that is not just a minimum competency examination on reading or arithmetic or simple or simplistically derived teaching skills. We need something which deals in depth with a number of academic areas and not mere minimum competence. We need something which assesses teachers' understanding of children and their development, the materials or the tools of teaching, the grouping of youngsters—in short, the complex pedagogical aspects of education.

Of course, teaching is basically a performing profession. You can get your Ph.D. in Shakespeare, but you may not be a very good actor or actress. A central part of the assessment, then, will be how does a person put knowledge and skills together in terms of performance?

I would like to conclude by saying that there is an awful lot of excitement among teachers and much of the public about the mission of the Board. There is a willingness to buy in. That will not last forever. If this thing gets dragged out because we are out there raising a lot of money, and if it takes 10 years or 15 years to do, people are going to start yawning. They will not believe in it any more.

We need to go quickly but not so quickly that we put something out that nobody believes in. So it must be done right, and it must be done right the first time. But we should not be missing this opportunity, this excitement, this willingness on the part of a massive number of teachers to accept some radical and revolutionary changes. We need your help on that.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Shanker follows:]

TESTIMONY OF

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

ON FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR THE NATIONAL BOARD

FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON

LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

February 18, 1988

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

The American Federation of Teachers strongly supports legislation to provide federal support for the Board for Professional Teaching Standards. It is our view that education is now at a crossroads, and that the direction we take will have a major impact on virtually every aspect of our national life. The Board for Professional Teaching Standards has requested money from the Federal Government in order to engage in research to produce tests which will examine what skills are needed to be a superior teacher. It is well to look at what currently exists in order to demonstrate the need for a new approach to testing and educational qualifications.

Currently, teacher tests are purely instrumental; they sort and screen, and set cut-off scores for minimum competency. Test questions are eliminated if too many of the sample test takers failed and while efforts are made to establish job relatedness existing tests often have no relationship to skills needed in the classroom. This kind of testing which dominates the teaching profession leaves a bad taste in everyone's mouth because it really has little or nothing to do with determining what skills are needed to support and enhance professional practices. This is the type of testing that afflicts teaching but need not be the norm any longer.

Another type of testing exists in other professions, but is largely unknown in education. Tests in almost every other profession seek to examine the professional knowledge base of the individual taking the test. These types of tests also

screen and have cut-off scores, but they seek to test what is worth knowing in order to be a competent professional. The successful lawyer, architect or doctor must pass such a test before being certified to practice. Passing scores for these exams do not fluctuate with job markets or pass rates. This type of testing which is common in other professions is greatly needed in education.

The purpose of the Professional Standards Board is to produce this type of testing instrument for the teaching profession. If this effort is successful, we believe the following things will happen: Teacher training instituitions will modify their curriculum to meet the new standards in the profession and more qualified people will aspire to meet the higher standards expected from teachers.

The availibility of such tests may drive efforts for increased compensation and as new standards are approved and met, student achievement will be positively effected. We also point out that some things will not happen: Teacher licensing will not become subject to the national Board. State and local officials will continue to hold licensing power, and, in all likelihood, will continue to make licensing decisions based upon market factors and financial realities. Not every teacher will be able to meet the new standards and with school reorganization it will not be necessary for every teacher to be Board certified.

The current situation in teacher testing must be changed if our schools are to meet the challenges of the 21st Century. The only way that teacher testing will change for the better is if

the Board for Professional Teaching Standards succeeds. Change in this area must come from an outside agency that has massive popular support. I believe the Board and the Carnegie report that launched the Board, do have support from the public.

The funds that have been requested are critical for the success of this enterprise. If federal support is not forthcoming, we may see this promising movement languish for several years missing the wave of public support that currently exists. If this movement for education quality does not succeed, the public will be poorer for the Congress' failure to invest the $25 million needed for its success.

The AFT agrees that any federal support provided should be earmarked for research alone. We also urge that any research done should become public property in order to help all who are concerned with improving the teaching force. Normal federal requirements for auditing and assurances that funds are matched and spent for the proper purposes are a must in this legislation. Beyond these requirements, however, we believe that the Board should be left alone to pursue its mission. Federal support has been made available for projects that serve the national interest with a minimum of strings-- I cannot think of another project that would better serve the national interest than one that will stimulate the improvement of the teaching profession.

A final reason for the Congress to act now is the tremendous leverage that a relatively small investment will now have on our educational future. Investing $25 million dollars now can pay

huge dividends in employability, competitiveness, and productivity of our workforce and our economy. These dollars could be the most crucial education support that the Congress votes in this decade. I urge swift positive action on this important matter.

I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

opeiu#2/aflcio

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Mr. Shanker. Well spoken.

Dr. Hatton, we welcome you.

Dr. HATTON. Thank you very much.

I have been sitting here all morning trying to figure out how I was going to leave three points on the table that you would never forget. I have not figured out how to do that yet, so I am just going to wade in and see what happens here.

I have spent all of my professional career in education. I am basically an eighth grade math teacher. That is what I like, that is what I do, and that is what I continue to use as a guideline for my work.

I moved from there to spend lots of time in college teaching and college administration, and I chaired a school board. I have done a little of everything, but most of that time I have been worried about access and equity to excellence in our schools and in our profession. It has sort of been a kind of mission with me, and I am now with a major foundation, as they say on the TV programs. I am with a major foundation pursuing these issues once again.

I accepted the nomination to the National Board because I believe that it will assist us in resolving one of the critical issues in the field today, and that is the minority teacher education shortage. This situation has been well documented in the news media and in various documents, and I will not go through details here today except to say that the minority teacher population in our public schools is declining; that as far as we can tell from preliminary results from a recent survey at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the enrollment patterns in our teacher preparation programs are not encouraging; that these teachers will be available to meet an increasing shortage of teachers in our schools.

When I was at Tuskegee—and I just left Tuskegee as dean of education—I would marvel at the number of recruiters that would come to our campus. I remember one year I had 55 different school districts represented on my campus looking for black teachers. I had 25 graduates. Those students of quality could have their pick of some of the finest teacher positions in this country. Each of them could have had two positions apiece just looking at it arithmetically, if they could meet the standards. And we took every step to meet the standards.

I want to concentrate really on the efficacy of the National Board's activity for ameliorating this shortage. I just want to talk about how I see this. It seems almost counter-intuitive to say that a board which seeks high standards, higher standards than are represented in the licensure activities of our States, will help us relieve a minority teacher shortage, because everybody sort of intuitively believes that if you have high standards, minorities will not meet them. Therefore, you will exacerbate the shortage.

Well, my experience in working with the students at Tuskegee and in working with many of the programs which produce most of the black teachers in our public schools—and I have been all over the South working with these programs in various capacities—is that we need not fear high standards. In fact, it is high standards which may provide, and I am convinced will provide, the greatest motivator to bringing black teachers back to the profession and to

bring some of the best minds in the black community back to the profession.

I told a little story in my prepared testimony about my experience in meeting the State Review in Alabama as dean of the school of Tuskegee. If you know anything about the early teacher education reform movement, we had all kinds of lovely standards implemented by the States deriving from their State licensure responsibilities for program accreditation. When I went to Tuskegee, I had to meet those. You could see the documents; they are two inches thick. You have to respond. You have two of these, five of those, six of those. Have you hired this kind of competence? Do you do this with your students?

And, of course, we are a very small school. We had not very much money. But we met every single standard and, in the process, improved our pass rate on the teacher testing standard of the State.

At the end of this very intense and very difficult process for our program—as I said, we were small—I looked up to find out that my two top graduates had not taken jobs as teachers after graduation. These students, I am not saying they passed the test. They knocked the top out of the test, 90th percentile, 96th percentile on the State test. Whatever you say about it, it is the test and they did knock it out. And here is one off in graduate school in a communications program, and here is another one off in graduate school in some other field. The best teachers that I produced, not only by the State standard but by teacher recommendations of these students who were able to go anywhere. One of them was recruited by one of the finest private schools in our system. Not to say anything about the public school standard, but to have a headmaster come to Tuskegee and sit for two hours for one of my students was a feather in our cap. And I do not have any problems saying that to you this morning.

The story I have told illuminates the ways in which our early teacher education reforms are not enough to help us deal with these persistent and continuing problems of access and equity in the profession. If we are really serious about dealing with this problem—and I have to believe that we are—we will look at the commitment of the board to hold itself accountable to developing a process that does not discriminate against minorities. All of our testing procedures now—and this is not a testing procedure. All we have now are testing procedures—do have an inherent bias built into them. I was glad to hear Mr. Shanker bring out the whole supply and demand function that these tests drive. Are the cut scores going to be set to assist in that process of staffing our schools?

More importantly, the assessment procedure the board proposes will not be a narrow spectrum, a narrow measure of teacher behavior or teacher knowledge, such as are the tests that we now have. This assessment procedure will be designed to give us a broad measurement of a broad spectrum of teaching behaviors, and this will give us a better picture of the quality of the minority student where we do not have the political machinery driving testing standards or driving testing content.

Finally, I would like to say that, although I have talked about the minority teacher shortage in my prepared testimony and in my statement here this morning, I just have to back up a minute. I do not want anybody to think that I think the National Board standard will help students in any way avoid standardized tests. I want to make it very clear that rigorously prepared minority students can pass anyone's test. The importance of the assessment procedure on that point, before I move to the other point, is that this procedure, unlike the testing patterns we are now facing, will give us the kind of feedback to our preparation programs so that we can better prepare students to meet whatever the standards of the profession may be. The quality of feedback that we are likely to get from the research that is carried out in the National Board process, and from the performance of our graduates who voluntarily seek the certification, will be of immense value in assisting educational leaders and faculty members to take a look at the programs to ensure that students are rigorously prepared.

Senator DODD. This was Jim Hunt's point. He called it pressure. Maybe it is another way of using the word.

Dr. HATTON. Yes. But it is essential to the minority student who is most likely prepared in a small school, not a large school, and a historically black school in the South where you do not have a lot of play room with the resources you are going to commit to development programs, to faculty development, and to purchasing new goods to add to your program. You have to really be sure that what you are doing when you hire a faculty member is improving your program because you really do not put this person over here and let him sit and earn his pay and get somebody else. Some people are rich enough to do that.

But in these schools where most of our black teachers are being trained, this kind of feedback is essential to program improvement, to program strength, and to program evaluation. Whether or not you are talking about improvement or strength, even those that are already strong and improving will be helped by this evaluation.

Finally, I just want to say that even though I have talked about the efficacy of the board's activities for ameliorating the minority teacher shortage, I am a former dean of education and I am a teacher educator. I do feel that I ought to say to you that the activities of the board will be very helpful in the development of that side of the profession as well.

I appreciate very much your allowing me to wade through this and try to get these three points out. There may have been 10 or 12, but I very much appreciate the opportunity to share my experience with you. I urge your support of the board's activities. I hope that you understand the tightness of the license process that we face in preparing teachers and the degree to which this gives our graduate an alternative, a set of rewards that we have not had in the past that can drive our programs to new heights.

Thank you so very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Hatton follows:]

TESTIMONY OF BARBARA R. HATTON
FOR PRESENTATION TO
THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS and HUMANITIES
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

THE UNITED STATES SENATE

FEBRUARY 18, 1988

Testimony of Barbara R. Hatton
February 18, 1988

I have spent my entire professional career in schools and colleges beginning as an eighth grade teacher of mathematics. Most of that time has been spent working to increase access and equity in the teaching profession and in our schools. I now pursue these issues from a new position as a foundation program officer. And I believe that one of the most critical issues facing the field is the minority teacher shortage. The shortage of minority teachers has reached crisis proportions. According to statistics compiled by the NEA, the proportion of minority teachers in the nation's schools declined from approximately 12% to 10% in the five year period from 1979 - 1985. Black teachers accounted for the largest portion of that decline. The recruitment of black teachers has become a significant activity for school systems with recruiters from these systems arriving on the campuses of historically black colleges and universities in numbers which exceed the numbers of teacher education graduates. Public policy analysts project an impending imbalance in our schools when a largely minority school population will be taught by a largely white teaching force.

I believe that achievement of the goals of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has the long term potential to stimulate major changes in the teaching profession and thereby create conditions for ameliorating this shortage. Such a belief may seem almost counterintuitive since the Board is commited to high standards in the teaching profession and it is widely believed that the imposition of high standards will exclude large numbers of minority students. So I hasten to explain how I came to this point of view.

Until a few months ago, I served as Dean of the School of Education at Tuskegee University. A personal example from that experience will illustrate the point. When I assumed the deanship a few years ago, I knew that a state review would occur in four months. Thus, one of my first acts was to ask the Chairman of the Self-Study Steering Committee to brief me on the status of our preparation for the review. She first presented me with a large notebook of hundreds of forms, checklists, and questionnaires which the faculty had worked months to complete in order to check our program against literally hundreds of state program standards, many of which had changed since the last review.

In effect, our review lasted the next eight months as we responded to the review team's recommendations. During that period, the Tuskegee program benefited from a renewed commitment to teacher education at the University. New resources were allocated and program changes were approved to enable the school to meet the myriad state standards. Here are but a few of the steps taken during that period.

- two faculty members were recruited and hired and a Science Educator from the College of Arts & Sciences agreed to join the faculty of the School of Education to provide leadership for the production of science teachers
- at least twenty-five courses were revised to incorporate state program and test objectives
- new developmental programs for test preparation were developed and piloted
- a new scholarship program to attract meritorious students to the university was approved
- passing rates on the Alabama Initial Teacher Certification Test (AITCT) increased

Then, at a time when we were making tremendous efforts to meet state and professional standards and achieving success in these efforts, institutional success rates on the AITCT were published. These results were lower than some of the other schools in the state and served to diminsh the efficacy of our success both on our own campus where we had been given tremendous support and among the constituency we serve. Because the school is small (and had no immediate plans for enormous growth), the pass rate was a particularly unfair measure of the program at the time. It is only one measure of the performance of the students who took the test (who were graduates of the old program and who had often repeated the test); but use of the percentage itself is a source of bias against the small school since one or two students can so effect the percentage as to distort this measure. No one seemed to care or notice that this small school had garnered the resources and energy to respond to the hundreds of state standards, improved its programs and dramatically <u>increased</u> the numbers of graduates who could meet the state testing standard. It was an extremely demoralizing moment in my tenure as dean. But I was even more affected by the news that the two graduates of the program who had scored highest on the teacher certification test had not taken jobs as teachers. Instead, they had decided to enter graduate schools and in fields other than education.

This story illuminates the ways in which our early teacher education reform efforts have served to exacerbate the minority teacher education shortage. These early reforms were designed to increase the effectiveness of the educational experience for all students since educational progress is tied to uniform measures of performance across all schools. During the early stages of reform, some educational leaders were able to use these reform measures to promote organizational change, to set high expectations for all students and to encourage the development of particularized strategies to meet the special needs of students.

In many instances, however, the basic implementation strategies of these early

reforms have frustrated the longstanding goals of increasing the performance and college enrollment rates of black and minority students. First, there has been the emphasis on improving the quality of education in this country through such means as raising admission standards and implementing student assessment programs using standardized test scores. To some educators and educational institutions, these measures have provided an incentive to simply screen out those students who do not meet the standards. To students with marginal preparation for college as well as to the academically talented, they are seen as unfair since they represent a narrow assessment of the ability of students to meet the new teaching standards. Primarily they have served as obstacles not present in other postsecondary opportunities.

Several recently published reports have provided documentation that the 1980s has been a period of stable or declining numbers and proportions of black and minority students in colleges and universities. The Southern Regional Education Board in its report, "The Enrollment of Black Students in Higher Education: Can Declines Be Prevented," states unequivocably that fewer black students will be enrolled in college in 1990 than today and black students will make up as smaller proportion of overall college enrollment, if present trends continue. An earlier report by the American Council on Education documents similar patterns of enrollment for both blacks and other minority groups.

Within this larger trend is a sharp drop in the number of black and minority education graduates. This is clearly related to another basic reform strategy wherein teacher education programs were the focus of standards and in-house reform measures to improve the quality of teachers. Efforts here have been devoted to the use of teacher certification tests to screen out so-called "incompetents" and to use of the test results for the purposes of program evaluation in state accreditation processes. In the short term, this has not resulted in the positive consequence of having more black and minority students meet higher standards. Most black teachers are still produced by historically black colleges and universities. And black enrollment in teacher education programs at these institutions has declined at double the rate of other member institutions of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. Black and minority teacher candidates have much lower passing rates on required certification tests than their white counterparts. Not incidentally then, the percentage of black and minority teachers in the total teaching force is declining. Extraordinary efforts have been expended in historically black colleges to assist students to meet the test standards and maintain a steady flow of black teachers.

As my earlier story illustrates, the most ardent intellectual energies can be dissipated in the effort to concentrate on teaching minority teacher candidates to pass unfair tests and there are few rewards to institutions or teacher candidates for developing and participating in other needed program interventions designed to improve the teaching act. The early reforms did not do enough the address the status and structure of the profession. Professional concerns (financial rewards, opportunities for advancement, and working conditions) are compelling factors in the decision of some of our best teachers and teacher candidates to seek other careers. The focus has been on making the profession attractive to those who might otherwise choose careers which appear to be more rewarding.

Unlike other professions, everyone experiences the life of the teacher through their experiences in schools. Everyone can view the unprofessional conditions

teachers face. This is doubly true for the minority youngster who is more likely to experience poor teaching situations in the schools which they attend and who resists the historical restriction of blacks to teaching and a few other professions. More importantly, the black and minority communities have touted carteers in the technological areas at the expense of the social service and human development areas. Students in minority communities are encouraged and rewarded for expressions of interest in engineering, business, and other lucrative occupations from which minorities have historically been excluded or underrepresented. When this was done without a substantial increase in the college enrollments from minority communities, the effect has been to simply shift the distribution of a relatively stable population of college attendees from the 'soft" areas to the "hard" areas.

The national certification process proposed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards can be expected to provide a basis for fundemental change in the way teaching potential is assessed, developed, and ultimately employed in schools. And while previous efforts to improve entry screening through assessment procedures have not been able to overcome the bias inherent in current testing procedures, the developers of the new certification process have agreed to hold themselves accountable for developing a process which does not discriminate against blacks and minorities. Most importantly, the Board is developing a process which assesses a broader spectrum of behavior and knowledge more closely related to the act of teaching. This alone can be expected to provide greater chance for success to minority students who have completed rigorous preparation programs.

Increasing concern about the minority teacher shortage has prompted many organizational initiatives - most of which are devoted to short-term recruitment and retention strategies. But for the long term, the National Board addresses a structural solution which embodies the interrelated causes of teacher supply and quality problems. To the extent that it is successful, it will provide a significantly more powerful incentive for the recruitment and retention of minority teachers.

And while I have concentrated on the efficacy of the Board's efforts in ameloriating the teacher shortage, it is important to note the positive consequence for teacher preparation programs more generally. The research and development work commissioned by the board will be made available to teacher preparation programs and will be of benefit to these programs in a number of important ways. Firstly, reliable feedback on the performance of program graduates is essential to program improvement. And the research to identify effective teaching behaviors will contribute to our capacity to prepare teachers who serve students better.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much. Very eloquent testimony. I think your point about how this will affect the curricula at various institutions of teachers is a significant one. It certainly complements a licensing program because the curricula will be geared more to the certification standards than licensing standards, so everyone benefits in that process. I think that point is well made.

Before we get to you, Mr. Blanchette, I am going to apologize to this panel. I thought we would be through a little earlier, and I am behind in everything. So I am going to turn the gavel over to someone who knows a lot more about education than I will ever know, Bob Stafford, who has been involved, as I said earlier before you were hear, father of most of the education programs we all think so highly of today.

I thank all of you for being here. We thank you, Mr. Blanchette, for coming down as a teacher. My apologies. I have some questions which I will submit if Bob Stafford does not cover them. We will get to work on this and see what we can do in the next couple of weeks.

Thank you very much.

Senator STAFFORD [presiding]. Mr. Blanchette, we would be very happy at this point to hear from you.

Mr. BLANCHETTE. Senator Stafford, I thank you for the opportunity to share what the National Board means to me and to my colleagues.

I believe that the core of the National Board's charge is the enhancement of the teaching profession as the most effective way to reach students. There is a direct correlation between the enhancement of the professional lives of teachers and enrichment of the intellectual and spiritual lives of students.

A teacher and a student are a team. What you do to one has a direct impact on the other. They cannot be separated. Perhaps the most enjoyable and rewarding part of my job is that I am aware on a daily basis—some days more than others—that I actually do make a significant difference to some people.

Sometimes that can be a little frightening. A few weeks ago, a former student of mine came back to visit. She had been graduated from school about four years ago. She was one of those students who was a project of mine. I "discovered" her. She was bright. She hated school. We worked together. She became able. She went to college. One of those stories.

She was telling me about her life and some things that had been happening to her. She was currently living on top of a mountain in southern Spain meditating or something. Prior to that, she had picked vegetables and fruits in Nicaragua, helping out the Sandinistas. I might add half of her head was shaved and the other half was dyed a lurid green. And she said to me, "Mr. Blanchette, I owe this all to you." [Laughter.]

I can assure you that I kept her downwind of my principal until I was able to get her out of the building.

State legislators can mandate that students take 47 years of a foreign language if they choose to do so, but it will not mean anything without a strong teacher working in that classroom.

In months to follow, complicated issues are sure to emerge surrounding the National Board, but let me suggest that when thinking about the merits of the National Board, you return to one simple idea: the board is about raising standards, and teachers need a vehicle that lets America know where excellence lies.

Teachers are crying out for higher standards. We are not afraid of them. We welcome the opportunity to pass muster. That we have a significant cadre of highly trained, hard-working professionals is America's best kept secret in my view. It is very disheartening to work hard and be dedicated to what you do and have nobody realize it. Sometimes it seems as if nobody outside of the classroom or building realizes that. An objective and uniform and accurate assessment system will get the news out.

One of the best teachers I have ever met retired two years ago. She was my mentor. She had taught for 40 years. She was 65 when she retired. I spoke to her last week, and I said, "You must really miss the classroom." She was a very dedicated teacher, and was totally devoted to the profession. I said, "You must miss the classroom. It must be terrible for you to be away from the kids."

She shocked me when she said that she doesn't miss it a bit. It took me aback. She was somebody I depended on a lot. And I said, "Well, why don't you miss it?" And she said that when she left teaching, it was the first time in 40 years that her life was not shot through with the feeling of being devalued. It hurt me that this woman who devoted 40 years of her life—she had two Master's degrees; she was excellently prepared, the whole bit—had spent 40 years of her career feeling at least in part devalued.

I believe that the National Board is a correct response to this problem, and to reiterate what several other people have said here today, it is a correct response to the problem of the impending teacher shortage.

As Senator Dodd illustrated earlier, there is a dwindling pool of teachers out there for various reasons. I do not have anything to add to that. The notion that it is not the time to raise standards because we face a teacher shortage is wrong—just plain wrong. It is exactly the time to raise standards. We are going to replace our teaching force. We do not want to replace our teaching force with teachers who are not excellent. The teacher shortage is a great opportunity. Now is exactly the time to raise standards. Lower standards and devalued teachers contribute to the shortage.

I did not start teaching until I was 31, but I always wanted to be a teacher. I was a freshman at a university. When I went to my college adviser and told him of my plans. He looked at my record and my SAT scores and whatever. He said, "I must say that I object to your choice, your career choice." He said, "Anybody can be a teacher. I would like you to be something else. I have faith in you that you can be something else."

I bought into that, unfortunately. I switched immediately out of the school of education, and I never took any education courses as an undergraduate. I got an undergraduate degree in English, and promptly after school I got a job as a third cook in a Mexican restaurant, which I kept for a significant amount of my life. It took 10 years, 11 years for me to get into teaching, but I almost did not become a teacher. It was very close.

I think that if we have raised expectations of teachers, a wonderful byproduct will be that the new teachers or the teachers for whom we have raised expectations will in turn have raised expectations themselves. Professionals who are committed to their work and are valued by their society, their school districts, and communities demand excellence themselves—not only from themselves but from their students, from administrators, from colleagues. They take risks. They expect a productive workplace. They desire and go for—demand, even—further professional development. They command professional salaries.

It is the same thing with teaching. If you have high expectations of your students, you can bank that they are going to have high expectations of you. If you have high expectations of your students, you cannot go into class unprepared. It does not work; it is a sham; it is hypocrisy.

So I really like that shakeout of raised expectations of teachers because teachers will turn around and expect the same all the way around.

I am especially excited, as Dr. Hatton is, about what the National Board means for teacher preparation programs. I think it will have a significant impact. Colleges will have a new goal: to graduate students who are likely to become board-certified teachers. It will be a marketplace. If you have one school whose students have difficulty eventually becoming board certified and another school whose students typically become board certified, the choice of schools will be the latter.

There will be a greater emphasis, I think, I imagine, in study within a field. As it is now, it is possible to become a secondary English teacher with alarmingly few courses in English. There is some change in the wind there, and I imagine the National Board will promote that change.

It will also be a significant change as far as what makes a competent teacher. I cannot imagine the board not having the impact of performance-based competencies. As it is now, you graduate from a teacher preparation program that is certified by the State, and you automatically get your license. That is it. That is how it works. At least it works in my State that way. Performance competencies and student teaching are not necessarily synonomous. Performance-based competency really should be a part of teacher preparation.

The task of the National Board is enormous and the charge crucial, and I believe that the entire operation hinges on the research and development of fair and accurate methods of assessment. In order to work, the board must be voluntary. I think that is clear. And no teacher will submit to an assessment that is reductive and that recognizes only a narrow range of teaching styles.

Therefore, I ask you to favorably consider the needs of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Blanchette follows:]

Bradley Blanchette
English teacher
Colchester High School
Colchester, Vermont 05446

Recently I have been involved in my school district's "School Talks," a series of fora that feature teachers speaking one week, administrators another, students another, and so on. Last week, parents had their turn, and they were very clear that excellent teachers make the most difference to the well-being of their children at school and, oftentimes, at home. Every good teacher knows this. Every good teacher can remember students whose lives changed for the better as a direct result of his or her teaching, of his or her caring. So although I'm here to discuss the merits of The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, my motive originates from the understanding that to speak of the enhancement of the teaching profession is merely another way to speak of the enrichment of the lives of our young people. The lives of students and teachers are inextricably fused. It is an ancient relationship founded in the knowledge that what is worth knowing is worth passing on, what is found to be essential for one generation will probably be helpful to the next. For us in America, the success of our democratic experiment is entirely dependent upon an enlightened citizenry, therefore we are compelled to endorse a national commitment to our students, teachers, and schools.

I view the National Board as fundamental to the educational reform movement because, simply, it aims to raise standards. Teachers rarely have been asked to meet high standards. (Notable exceptions to this are states that have autonomous, teacher majority professional standards boards in place.) For most of us, our teaching license means nothing more than the state's determination that we will not cause the public any damage! As a practitioner of the profession, I daily am made aware of teacher-heroes who work tirelessly to improve their own intellects while reaching out to touch the minds of their students. But I know about this because I am on the inside. If the National Board adopts an objective and accurate assessment system for teachers, the news will get out: it's hard to become a certified teacher; not everyone can withstand the rigorous

training and tough assessments. In Vermont, taxpayers like to know what they're paying for, and I assume that it's the same everywhere. I and many of my colleagues welcome the opportunity to prove to the public that we're open to scrutiny, constructive criticism, and enhanced professional development.

Although I believe the teaching force currently in place will fare well under the public eye, there is trouble ahead. Recently I served as a member of the Vermont Teacher Shortage Task Force, and we discovered that even Vermont is not immune to the conditions that have a negative impact on the potential teaching force. We no longer can rely upon competent and talented women for whom teaching was the plum of professional opportunity. We don't seem to be attracting bright high school students to enter teacher preparation programs. We can't keep licensed teachers in the classroom. (Vermont has 6,000 practicing teachers and another 4,000 persons licensed to teach but who don't.) And we have an aging teacher population, quickly heading for retirement. Yet these problems offer a special opportunity. Instead of reacting to the teacher shortage by lowering standards, we must have the courage to react by raising them. The type of new teacher we need is one who is attracted by exacting requirements, difficult challenges, opportunity for professional achievement and status, and a professional salary.

Raised expectations of our teachers will, in turn, generate raised expectations by our teachers. Educators [illegible] themselves as professionals demand excellence from their students and their administrators. In my experience, the more competent the teacher, the more likely s/he is to take risks and to expect a certain tolerance of failure. Persons confident of their training and expertise need to work in an environment that protects their academic freedoms, allows them to exercise their capabilities, and supports their professional development. A dynamic workplace that offers challenges and excitement for both students and teachers would inevitably attract a highly qualified faculty.

But from where would we get these new teachers? Most of us who have endured teacher preparation programs quail at the thought of turning to

them for new teachers. Colleges and universities, however, have designed their curricula around the requirements of state government licensing agencies. In my opinion it's too easy to obtain a license in most states. A license doesn't reflect professional excellence; it is simply a statement that minimum requirements have been met. Teacher preparation programs have graduated students to meet these minimum standards because they were the only standards in place. I am extremely hopeful that the National Board will provide a focus for colleges who wish to graduate young people who are qualified to initiate the certification process. The job market will exert great pressure on higher education: few high school students will apply to a college that has the reputation of graduating students who are unable to find jobs because they cannot approach certification.

The task of the National Board is enormous; the charge, crucial. And the entire operation hinges on the development of appropriate methods of assessment. Perhaps no greater challenge faces the teaching profession than the one to determine what lies behind the answers to the questions: Is this teacher creating a context in which learning is happening? Is this classroom an exciting place to be in? Most of us who have gone through school could easily answer, but it is extremely difficult to assess the variables the artful teacher employs; the National Board must pinpoint what few of us in the classroom are able to make explicit. To succeed, any national assessment cannot be reductive, cannot endorse a narrow range of teaching styles only. In addition, teachers must have faith in its accuracy, and therefore the process must include a full range of assessment techniques, including extended classroom visits. I believe the National Board is committed to developing fair and objective appraisal systems, and there is encouraging research emerging from Lee Shulman's Teacher Assessment Project at Stanford.

I believe that the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards offers our nation a great challenge: Let us do the very best for our students by providing them with teachers who are highly trained, professionally active, knowledgeable, and valued. I ask that you favorably consider financially supporting the National Board.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. Blanchette.

In view of the hour and the persuasive way all of you have presented the case, I am not going to ask you questions. I think Senator Dodd may submit a few in writing. We may also, if that is agreeable, later on after we have had a chance to review the record.

I have to say, I have sat through hearings in this Congress now for 28 years, and I cannot recall a time when the witnesses who appeared in front of us were so unanimous in their viewpoint on an issue as you have been this morning. There has only been one opponent of the $25 million grant, and that witness was apparently in favor of the board but not the Federal money.

So it has been a persuasive and eloquent morning for the Senate to have you here and give us your views. We will take them very seriously, I can assure you, and we thank you all very much for coming.

Senator Simon has a statement he wishes to be placed in the record. So without objection—and I see nobody here to object—we will make it a part of the record.

[The prepared statement of Senator Simon, and additional material supplied for the record follow:]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PAUL SIMON (D.Ill.) AT THE
OVERSIGHT HEARING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
ARTS, AND HUMANITIES ON THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR
PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

February 18, 1988

Chariman Dodd, Senator Stafford and other members of the Subcommittee, I want to begin by welcoming Governor Hunt and Governor Kean to the Subcommittee and saluting them for their outstanding leadership at the state level on public education issues. I also want to commend my friend and colleague Chris Dodd for holding these hearings today on one of the most critical issues we face in education -- improving the standards and qualifications of those who teach our children.

I strongly support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and want to work with Senator Dodd in drafting legislation to provide some federal funds to support a partnership to facilitate the research which is so critical to the Board's work. In my view, nothing is more important to the future of our Nation, than the establishment of professional standards by which we can measure the skills and knowledges necessary to determine who should teach. That does not mean that we will take the States out of the licensure business or that a national test should be adopted which will certify teachers.

What we do need is a basis for understanding the skills all teachers ought to have before they enter the classroom and standards by which we can judge those who desire to enter the teaching profession. I support this effort. As I travel around the country and listen to teachers, as well as those who teach teachers to teach, the words I hear most often are "profession" and "respect." In general, we believe teachers want more pay -- something which they truly deserve -- but if we want to attract 'the best and the brightest' to the profession and keep them there, we have to find that intangible in people's minds which will make people say "I want to be a teacher" or "there goes a leader in our community, she's a teacher."

Conducting this important research and establishing national professional teaching standards is a big step toward RESPECT for teachers and the job they do!

As a member of the House of Representatives, I had the privilege of chairing the first-ever congressional hearings on the status of teaching and the Merit Pay Task Force. NEA President Mary Hatwood Futrell and AFT President Al Shanker both served with me on the Task Force with distinction. I am pleased to see that the heads of two major teacher organizations have not only worked to establish this Board, but are both here to support the funding request. I also note that Dr. Sharon Porter Robinson is accompanying Mrs. Futrell. I met Sharon's parents in Louisville, Kentucky recently. Her father is Chairman of the University of Louisville Board of Trustees and a former member of the old Louisville Board of Education -- which allowed a member of my staff, Bud Blakey, to graduate from one of its high schools! I reminded Mr. and Mrs. Porter that Sharon testified before my House subcommittee and was an excellent witness.

I look forward to working with you Mr. Chairman on this legislation.

Statement For The Record

On

A Proposal To Establish A Special Funding Relationship Between

The Federal Government

And

The National Board For Professional Teaching Standards

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

MARCH 1988

On Behalf Of

The American Association of
Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036

The Council for Educational
Development and Research
1201 16th Street, Suite 305
Washington, DC 20036

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the Council for Educational Development and Research (CEDaR) appreciate the opportunity to present testimony, for the record, on a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) proposal to be given a sole source award to support its research and development efforts. Our organizations believe the federal government has an appropriate role in establishing an agenda for educational research and monitoring the use of federal research dollars to assure they are allocated through a process of open competition and rigorous peer review. The proposal put forward by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards does not offer these assurances, and for that reason we cannot support it. Our quarrel is not with the board, only its request for a special funding relationship with the government.

Open competition for research dollars and a strong peer review mechanism are key to maintaining the integrity of the research enterprise. A decision by the Congress to make a sole source award to a particular organization--any organization--undermines the honesty of the research system. Congress established the National Institute of Education, now the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), to oversee and administer research on Congressionally established issues. If it is Congressional intent to promote further research on teacher assessment techniques or issues of teacher professionalism, why not direct and fund the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to have such studies conducted?

Members of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards argue they don't trust OERI, and they are uncomfortable with Secretary of Education Bennett and Assistant Secretary for Research Finn. Is it reasonable to give a sole source award to a new structure, bypassing any kind of open competition and peer review, merely because a certain group of persons does not like the existing agency and the persons who work there? If the Congress accepts the argument that the federal officials at OERI are not carrying out legislative intent, Congress has the power to remove those persons. Congress created OERI and congress has authority to rectify problems with the organization.

Supporters of federal funding for the NBPTS argue this board is so important that principles of open competition should be ignored. We cannot accept that argument. If establishing a mechanism to fund research on teacher assessment is important, and if Congress determines that such a study cannot be conducted by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, then any research funds awarded to an external body should be done through a process of open competition. Such a process has been employed very effectively to fund the ERIC system, Regional Education Laboratories and major Research Centers. If the NBPTS is determined, through a peer review process, to be the most worthy group to administer these studies, then, and only then, should it receive the funds.

The proposal put forward by the NBPTS offers virtually no accountability for the federal dollars they request. While AACTE and CEDaR do not support burdensome and unnecessary regulations, we believe that the government has the obligation to assure a fair accounting of taxpayers' dollars. A spokesperson for the NBPTS has argued that the board is a "unique and distinctive" organization that must maintain some independence from the government. We agree that a professional credentialling board should be independent. This is the case for boards that certify other professionals. However, the NBPTS seems to want the best of both worlds; they want to separate themselves from any external influences but want public funds to do so. We believe the board needs to determine which is most important--taking federal money with the accountability that money requires, or assuring that [they] "have not been influenced, coerced, or otherwise manipulated by the federal government."

No other national, voluntary credentialling board receives federal support of this kind. If the Congress decides to bypass the traditional mechanisms of open competition and peer review and awards the NBPTS a sole source grant, precedent has been set to continue this practice for other groups. It seems reasonable that organizations which license or certify physicians, attorneys, nurses, or ministers should also be eligible for such fundings.

We support Congressional interest in funding research on the assessment of teachers. However, we cannot endorse a sole source award that bypasses guidelines established and supported by the research

community regarding open competition and peer review. The ideas being advanced by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards are worthy of consideration. We urge the Congress to provide necessary funds to the Office of Educational Research and Improvement so this research agenda may move forward.

For additional information please contact:

Penelope Earley, Director
Policy Development, Public and
Governmental Relations
AACTE

E. Joseph Schneider
Executive Director
CEDaR

Senator STAFFORD. With that, the committee stands adjourned.
[Whereupon, at 12:55 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]